THE INCREDIBLE SCOFIELD AND HIS BOOK

By
JOSEPH M. CANFIELD

© Copyright 1988
Joseph M. Canfield

ROSS HOUSE BOOKS
Vallecito, California
1988

CONTENTS

Foreword
Introduction
1. Beginnings 1
2. The Yankee Heritage and How It Came to Michigan 4
3. The Start of the "French Connection" 11
4. The War Between the States 15
5. Antietam—And All That 20
6. In Between 26
7. Scofield's French Connection 33
8. In Kansas—Playground of the Secret Six 38
9. The Senator and the District Attorney 47
10. The District Attorney Resigns 52
11. Missing His Day in Court 57
12. The Role of Tom McPheeters 65
13. The Heir of the Plymouth Brethren or "Meet Me in Saint Louis" 74
14. The Press and the Minister 79
15. A Bill of Divorcement 87
16. The Fate of the First Family 92
17. Pastor and Benedict 95
18. The Doctrinal Statement of a Minister 102
19. A Growing Ministry 108
20. Peripatetic Pastor 114
21. The Balmy Niagara Bible Conference 122
22. Into the Mauve Decade 133
23. Under the Elm Trees (Massachusetts) 142
24. "Dr." Scofield and Mr. Moody 154
25. The Dispensational Norm or "Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth" 166
26. Defender of the Faith 171
27. Across the Bounding Main 184
28. The Road to Oxford 190
29. Accepted by Oxford 199
30. The Scofield Reference Bible 208
31. A Touch of Fame 221
32. Scofield Postpones the Kingdom and Sinks the *Titanic* 235
33. Prophecy Enters Good Society 249
34. A New School and a New Church 258
35. A Mix-up in Dates 267
36. "Paul and Timothy" or The Role of Charles G. Trumbull 281
37. Gathered Unto His Fathers 288
38. The Perils of Probate 295
39. Canonizing a Dispensational Saint 298
40. In Conclusion 309

FOREWORD

Research for this book started in 1975. By 1980 the manuscript was advanced enough that it became appropriate to look for a publisher. I discovered that despite the popularity of Scofield's work and the widespread recognition of his role, no one was interested in a study of the man, himself. A number of Evangelical publishing houses refused to even receive the manuscript for the most cursory reading. They claimed that a life of Scofield was not needed. Several firms did look at the manuscript, but returned it without any suggestion for edit, development or anything else.

As a result, in 1984, we decided to issue the first printing in letterpress format. As issued, it did have all the defects of a privately printed work. The response among non-Dispensationalists was so great that five more limited printings were made. Copies have gone all over the world. The response was enthusiastic. Many letters reached me from people who thanked me for making public what was already known about Scofield, but was not admitted by the Dispensationalism (who might well be called Pessimillenarians).

It was ignored by the Dispensational movement, schools, churches and pastors, almost. . . . One exception. Late in November, 1984, Walter Osborn, research librarian at Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, ordered a copy. Walter has been more than helpful to me during my research in the late 1970's and for this I am truly grateful. For some reason, Walter did not use a standard library purchase order form, but dictated a letter to me. Nor was payment made by a Moody Bible Institute check drawn on a Loop bank. Payment was by a personal check of a person unknown, possibly one of the library staff. The book was sent to Chicago, and I understand it is still in the Moody Library. But I do wonder why some felt that the accounts of Moody Bible Institute were not to show a payment of even a small sum in my favor.

The book continued to be ignored by the Pessimillenarians, until . . .

In May, 1986, I purchased a copy of Dr. Bob Jones' memoirs, *Cornbread and Caviar.* Allowing for eschatological differences, I liked many parts of the book and wrote Jones to that effect, mentioning as I wrote my Scofield study (a copy had been purchased by the BJU Library). Jones wrote me on May 19, 1986, thanked me for my letter and my comments on *Cornbread and Caviar.* He also said: "I shall have the library send over to me your book on Dr. Scofield and try to read it with as charitable a spirit as you have read *Cornbread and Caviar.*" Dr. Jones called the library, read, and then things started to happen.

It would appear that Fundamentalism was shaken by the revelations about their "Saint." One of the BJU faculty, David O. Beale, was at work on a study of Fundamentalism, which did come out under the title, "In Pursuit of Purity, American Fundamentalism Since 1850." My Scofield study could not go unnoticed, but Beale's work was too far along for a major rewrite. So I did receive "notice" in part of a footnote. On Page 46, Beale, in Footnote 6 says, "There is a spiteful and inadequately documented attack on Scofield's character . . . Canfield attempts to descredit the pretribulation rapture [Sorry, Dave, it already well discredited!], concludes that Scofield possibly was not even a Christian. . . ."

Now whatever one might say about my attitude or the tone of my work, Beale's charge of "inadequate documentation" is completely false. The footnotes, scores of them, at the end of each chapter—show very, very careful documentation, the result of extensive rsearch and a determination to present the truth about my subject. Beale's Footnote 6 is not the only thing in the work which makes the word "Purity" in the title questionable.

In *Cornbread and Caviar*, Bob Jones devoted a number of pages to his visit with British writer C. S. Lewis. I felt that that incident made it essential that Jones' memoirs be included among the Lewisiana in the Marion E. Wade Collection in Wheaton, Illinois. I made such a suggestion to Dr. Lyle Dorsett, curator of the collection, who did acquire Jones' book. I never anticipated that my kindness in recommending Jones' book to a collection into which it would not otherwise have been placed would be countered with the inaccurate Beale footnote (which may have been written with a libelous intent). Dr. Dorsett, commenting on the incident, said, "I am sure they go after you with a vengeance. Is this Love? What kind of fruit is it?"

Beale appears quite satisfied with his "value-judgment." A purchaser of my book took Beale to task for his erroneous footnote. Beale, on October 30, 1986, replied to my Illinois friend, indicating complete approval his utterly incorrect term "inadequate documentation" and referring to one of the most shoddy pieces of religious journalism which discussed my study as a ". . . very careful review."

Knowing his position on matters eschatological, I had, back in 1984, sent a copy of *The Incredible Scofield* to Rev. Robert L. Sumner, self-styled evangelist and editor of *The Biblical Evangelist*, a paper then issued from Murfreesboro, Tennessee. I did this in the hope of Premillennial reaction. Strangely enough, there was no reaction until after Dr. Bob Jones had read my work. But when it come, it was terrifically "shoddy."

On June 3, 1986, Rev. Sumner wrote me, stating that he was going to review my book and asking for biographical material, including

eduational background. I gave him the information requested and during the summer we exchanged several letters. Sumner's tone suggested that he did not believe many of my statements. And always there was the implication that Dispensationalism was the only true Biblical position and that those who were true Christians did not disagree.

Sumner's view came out in the November, 1986, issue of *The Biblical Evangelist.* Sumner spread over 20 pages of his paper a diatribe which would have received kudos from William Randolph Hearst. In the 20 pages, Sumner never once considered the very abundant documentation which gave me very good legal basis for saying that Scofield was not what he claimed to be. Rather, Sumner took statements of Dispensationalists and Trumbull's "childish" book as verity and then tried to cut me down and impugn my motives. Worse, Sumner plainly stated that my education does not qualify me to write about Scofield.

Rather than wade endlessly through Sumner's vicious nonsense, I would give but two examples to Dispensational unwillingness to be factual. In my chapter 23, I declare that I consider Scofield's claim of the right to use the title *Doctor* and the initials "D.D." to be false. I indicated a willingness to withdraw my charge if the Dispensational hierarchy could produce a reference to the event at which the degree had been conferred.

One would expect normal people to check graduation and similar records and demolish me by giving school and place of the conferring of the degree. I would gladly accept such information. That is not the Dispensational way. My challenge has been ignored. I have, instead been blasted for defaming a dead man.

In chapter 35, I question the "French medal" which supposedly had been awarded to Scofield, noting that the famous French Academy in Paris had been unable to help me. Again, the normal reaction would have been to ask Mrs. Lawrence Freas (Scofield's granddaughter), Pastor Ashcraft of The Scofield Memorial Church, or someone else who revered Scofield to produce the medal, if it exists. Again, I would gladly retract. Instead my integrity and my Christian commitment are inpugned.

These two illustrations make a mockery of a statement in Dr. Sumner's letter to me of October 24, 1986: "I sincerely hope that my plain, frank review will undo part of the damage you have done. Although, as I show in quoting reviews of your work, this kind of slander can never to completely undone. Every single one of these reviews, based in misinformation, has 'added' to what you said and made the matter worse." Now the two illustrations I have given show that my charges are not "misinformation." The reviews which Sumner refers to were comments by R. J. Rushdoony, J. R. Boyd (Sudbury, Ontario) and Geoffrey Thomas of Aberystwyth, Wales, all of whom commend my work. Sumner, in concluding his 20 pages, blasted these fine men just as hard as he went after me.

Despite the fact that none of my documentation was disputed, Sumner in a letter of November 13, 1986, insisted that my research had been challenged. Not so! Sumner further felt entirely proud of his "throwing dung" at the gentlemen just named because they also refused to worship at the altar of Scofield.

Sumner refused to allow my views to be presented to his readers. In the same letter he said; "My editorial decision not to publish the latter (my reply) has nothing to do with *courage*; it is strictly a matter of *value*. There is nothing therein that I have not answered."

Which is, of course, completely untrue. Sumner was referring to a letter which the editor of *Christian News*, New Haven, Missouri, was kind enough to publish in which I had replied to Beale's inaccurate footnote referred to above.

The editor of *Christian News* did allow me to publish a long and carefully written answer to Sumner. It did result in my receiving orders for my work from quarters which I would never have reached otherwise. Sumner, in his January, 1987, issue, published letters which he had received from Dispensationalist readers who had read his diatribe, but had not "profaned" themselves by seeing what I had written. It would appear that the Dispensationalist view is "Don't confuse me with the facts, my mind is made up!"

Meantime, many of my friends wrote Sumner to protest his utterly unfair treatment of me (written with the apparent approval of Dr. Bob Jones). After a time, Sumner asked my friends to stop writing him ("My mind is made up!")

Note should be made of one other Dispensational reaction. In July, 1986, Rev. George Zeller, assistant pastor of the Middletown Bible Church, Middletown, Connecticut, purchased a copy of *The Incredible Scofield*. He issued a four-page, very negative review. (It may have been published in some Dispensational periodical such as the IFCA *VOICE*.) His review at least indicated that, in contrast to Sumner, he really tried to consider some of the issues I had raised. But he, too, assumed that most of my charges against Scofield were falsehoods, and he joined with A. C. Gaebelein, Lewis Sperry Chafer and others in crying about the unfairness of attacking a dead man (who lives through his writings).

Zeller did list charges I made against Scofield and seemed to consider them irrelevant and refused to take them seriously. Then the critique assumes that Dispensationalism has *always* been a part of Christian teaching and can be found in the Scriptures. This, of course, is utterly untrue and has been disproved in volume after volume.

Both Sumner and Zeller limit their credibility in their belief that Dispensationalism is the only true way to interpret Scripture. Worse, they seem completely convinced that no one can take exception to

Dispensationalism except from unworthy motives and with evil intent. Not so!

In the summer of 1976, the British humor magazine *PUNCH* sent a reporter to Dallas, Texas, to look at the state of the church, especially its Fundamentalist variant. In the article which resulted, the writer used the term "God-bothering." This relation suggests that Sumner, Zeller and Beale and other Pessimillenarians are really "God-botherers," not servants of the Most High. Certainly in "dividing the Word of Truth," they have eliminated Galations 5:22, 23.

After the exchanges with "Christian" narrow minds and the slander which they generate, I am more than grateful that Dr. R. J. Rushdoony has seen fit to place my work on the list of Ross House Books.

JOSEPH M. CANFIELD

INTRODUCTION

> "The Christian Church still awaits a definitive comprehensive study of the entire subject of the second advent of Christ as it is revealed in the New Testament, including a *careful investigation of the history of interpretation* and the influence of this profound truth in the creeds and literature of the church, and in the lives of believers in the Lord Jesus Christ." [EMPHASIS ADDED]

So said the late Dr. Wilbur M. Smith in his column *In The Study* in *Moody Monthly*, March 1957. Such a study has not appeared, and the voluminous literature on the subject generally concerns itself with interpretation, not with the history of the interpretation, its newness or its traditions. Another area is almost completely overlooked—the lives of prophetic teachers and thinkers. The cult leaders, William Miller and Joseph Smith, have been examined and dissected, but we know virtually nothing about men whose teaching has been held to be in the Protestant mainstream.

The libraries of Evangelical schools have more than a shelf on D. L. Moody, and one can learn of Calvin, Luther, Wesley, Whitfield, Robert Murray McCheyne and even J. Gresham Machen. J. N. Darby's writings are always found on the shelf, but we really do not know the man himself.

One would expect a shelf, or a roomful, of studies on Cyrus Ingerson Scofield, but that expectation has not been realized. A Christian radio station has for years run a series, *Stories of Great Christians*, but a check shows that the life of C. I. Scofield has never been featured.

Only one book has been written about one of the most popular men in Evangelical history. That book is: *The Life Story of C. I. Scofield*, by Charles G. Trumbull (Oxford University Press, New York, 1920). Referred to in the present work as "Trumbull", it proved an important source of material. In 1960, a then master's student at Southern Methodist University, completed a thesis: *A Biographical Sketch of C. I. Scofield: A Thesis Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Southern Methodist University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master of Arts with a Major in History*, by William A. BeVier (B.A., Drury College, 1950) May 1960. "BeVier" (as it is referred to here) has not been published. It is found in the libraries of some Evangelical schools and has important details of Scofield's life.

In 1942-43, Arno C. Gaebelein wrote a series of articles for *Moody Monthly*, "The Story of the Scofield Reference Bible." Gaebelein included certain biographical notes not published elsewhere. (The articles were

later issued as a pamphlet by Gaebelein's publishing house, Our Hope.) This is referred to as "Gaebelein".

Those three items represent the only prepared sources for material on Evangelical Dispensationalism's most popular figure. Is it any wonder that as a partial response to Wilbur Smith's challenge, an investigation was undertaken into the life of Cyrus Ingerson Scofield?

CHAPTER 1

Beginnings

> *"To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven: A time to be born, and a time to die."*
>
> Eccl. 3:1,2a

A photograph taken late in his life shows a heavy-jowled man with a white moustache and a full head of white hair. His name, Scofield, identifies the most widely circulated commentary-Bible in Christendom. In Dallas, Texas, a church is honored to bear his name in its title.

Writing about him in the summer of 1919, Charles G. Trumbull, a leading religious editor and author, noted this facet of Cyrus Ingerson Scofield:

> Dr. Scofield loves all nature—not only men and women and children, but the whole created world, still so beautiful in spite of what Satan and sinners have done to mar God's work.[1]

A famous preacher-orator of the South, George W. Truett, made this comment:

> Every one felt that he was a prince of true men. And what a friend he was. A man who would have friends must show himself friendly. Along with these qualities he was kindly, full of good will and cheer which radiated from him as the light from the sun. When with him you knew you were in the presence of one who knew what he believed. Christ was real to him.[2]

Speaking of his teaching, a layman said of Scofield:

> He had every mark of a true Christian. He studied and comprehended the Bible in a way possessed by few men and passed on his prophetic knowledge in such a simple form that he who runs may read.[3]

It is that prophetic teaching which made his major work, *The Scofield Reference Bible* significant. Speaking of that Book's impact, a recent commentator said:

> The various millennial currents were most effectively solidified in *The Scofield Reference Bible*. The significance of the Scofield Bible cannot be overestimated.[4]

And, as the layman noted, the millennial currents were solidified in a simple form. The prophetic teaching is what we today remember Cyrus Ingerson Scofield for. As another author has said: "... in the calendar of Fundamentalist saints no name is better known or more revered."[5]

That depiction, spread around the world in religious advertisements, articles and books, is about all the Christian community knows of the man behind the honored name.

Late in life, Scofield recalled a boyhood along the Raisin River in Michigan. The Scofield farm, where he spent that boyhood, was only in its first years as cleared land. The surviving trees of the primeval forest were yielding to the demand for lumber and to satisfy the insatiable appetite for more land.

Around Clinton, Michigan, the felled trees became lumber in a sawmill, run by the boy's grandfather, Thomas Goodrich, and his father, Elias Scofield. The current of the Raisin River turned a mill wheel which powered the sawmill. The water flowed on into the Detroit River, through Lake Erie, over Niagara Falls reaching the sea via the St. Lawrence River.

Lenawee County (where Clinton is located) was part of the "Old Northwest"—that territory taken from the British by George Rogers Clark and organized by the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. But it had not been easy to make the "taking from England" stick in the Raisin River country. The British held Detroit right up to the War of 1812.

The Indians remained loyal to England. During August 1812, there were two encounters between poorly led American troops and the Indians along the Raisin River. Both encounters ended in ignominious retreat for the Americans, with dead and wounded left to the Indians and British. The end of the War in 1815 left the settlers in the area destitute. The Indians, without support of the British, raided and killed. It took several years for Territorial Governor Cass to bring order into the Territory of Michigan. But even the Indian threat did not deter land hungry settlers. They started pouring in even before the Indian menace ended.

In 1823, a group from Jefferson County, New York, acquired land in the Raisin River Valley near the town of Tecumseh. One of that group was Thomas Goodrich, maternal grandfather of C. I. Scofield.

Goodrich went back to Jefferson County in 1824 to move his family to the new lands. They were ten days sailing across Lake Ontario; then crossed the country to Buffalo with their teams. At Buffalo, they boarded a schooner which was to prove unseaworthy. It took eleven days to cross Lake Erie to Monroe, Michigan. The first Goodrich family home was an abandoned cabin near Tecumseh.

Demand for lumber was high and the supply seemed limitless as the land had to be cleared, so Thomas Goodrich erected a sawmill along the Raisin River above Tecumseh. In the 1820's, the country was still frontier, rough frontier. The Indians were still around. From a family history comes this experience of Scofield's Grandmother Goodrich:

> One day when he was absent an Indian came to his house, and seizing his daughter Deborah, dragged her out and tried to make her drink some whiskey. Her mother followed, and the Indian asked her to drink also. Pretending to do so, the Indian released the daughter and they both escaped to the house and barricaded the door, while the younger children sought safety in the garret. The Indian tried to break down the door, but failing, began to split it with an ax, and the mother and daughter retreated to the garret, pulled the ladder up after them, and guarded the opening with clubs. Finding himself defeated, the Indian started for the house of Ira Goodrich, who with his wife and children were all sick. Deborah ran three miles to the mill where her father was at work, and gave the alarm, and he and others ran to the rescue.[6]

Things did settle down. On April 21, 1831, Goodrich wrote to his daughter, Abigail Goodrich Scofield, and son-in-law, Elias Scofield, who were still living in the town of LeRay in upstate New York, not far from Watertown. One part of the letter is of special interest here:

> . . . Surely when I left Jefferson County I expected you to make us a visit before this time if not to have settled here. Our country continues to settle rapidly we have 3 sawmills in this town and we can hardly supply the demand for lumber there is a thriving village begun 2 miles above us up the River on the Ohio Turnpike. No country furnishes better encouragement for carpenters and joiners than this I belief you could find constant employment for each if you were here. . . .[7]

To encourage the younger couple, Thomas urged: "Sell and come here and leave that frightful climate."[8] Winters in Jefferson County, New York, are severe, far worse than in southeastern Michigan.

Two years later, in 1833, Elias and Abigail Scofield, with two children, left "The North Country" and moved to Lenawee County, Michigan.

CHAPTER 1 NOTES

1. Charles G. Trumbull, *The Life Story of C. I. Scofield,* Oxford University Press, New York, 1920, p. 125.
2. Tribute of Dr. George W. Truett, spoken at a Memorial Service for C. I. Scofield, in Dallas, Texas, on Sunday, November 27, 1921, as reported in *The Dallas Morning News*, Monday, Nov. 28,, 1921, p. 7
3. Statement of George W. Dealey at the same service, reported as indicated.
4. Dwight Wilson, *Armageddon Now!*, Baker Book House, 1977, p. 15.
5. Ernest R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism, British and American Millenarianism, 1800-1900*, University of Chicago Press, 1970, p. 222.
6. From "The Goodrich Family" a family history. Supplied by Mr. Richard B. Krammerer of Gettysburg, Pa., grandson of Laura Scofield Eames, sister of C. I. Scofield. The incident is reported on page 374.
7. The original letter is in the possession of Richard B. Krammerer.
8. *Ibid.*

CHAPTER 2

The Yankee Heritage

"Look unto the rock whence ye are hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence ye are digged."

Isaiah 51:1b

On October 8, 1837, Elias and Abigail Scofield accepted the deed to a tract of land in the Towns of Clinton and Newberg, Lenawee County, Michigan. They were part of a wave of Yankees and Yankee culture which spread out from New England, finally spending itself on the shore of the Pacific.

For the Scofield line, it had started in 1639 when Daniel Scofield appeared in Connecticut. According to family tradition as related by C. I. Scofield, Daniel had come from Lancashire, England. [1]

By the time of Scofield's grandfather, the family had made its first move—a short one—in a westerly direction. Elisha Scofield was born March 20, 1765, in Bedford, Westchester County, New York (Westchester County adjoins Connecticut).

Elisha served in the Revolutionary War. In 1781 he enlisted in Capt. Richard Sackett's Company. He re-enlisted in 1782 and served as Corporal.[2] On April 24, 1785, Elisha, now a citizen of the new republic, married Abigail Ingerson (the first Abigail Scofield).

A list prepared in June 1790 by the First Congregational Church of Greenfield, New York, in Saratoga County, shows Elisha as a member. The second family move was in a northerly direction. The Scofields stayed in the Town of Greenfield for about 20 years. All of their fourteen children, both those born in Bedford and those born in Greenfield, were baptized in the Greenfield Church.

Sometime prior to 1812, the Elisha Scofields moved to LeRay, Jefferson County, New York, just north of Watertown. The region is known as "The North Country," and as its name suggests, it is subject to severe winters and very heavy snowfalls shared with adjoining Canadian territory.

In 1848, Elisha Scofield, Sr., then 76, was listed as living with his son, Elisha, Jr. (not Elias). He died September 6, 1859, in the Town of Teresa also in Jefferson County. Burial was in the Evans Mills Cemetery near Watertown.

Our sources indicate that Cyrus' father, Elias, was the eighth child of Elisha and Abigail Ingerson Scofield. Elias was born June 19, 1798, in Greenfield and baptized on the 5th of August in the First Congregational Church.

In Jefferson County, the Scofields became acquainted with the Goodrich family; Thomas, Catharine and children. The Goodriches were settled in "The North Country" by the turn of the century. On February 5, 1823, Elias Scofield married Abigail Goodrich (the second Abigail Scofield). Abigail was born on November 17, 1802. The couple were to become the parents of Cyrus Ingerson Scofield and six other children.[3]

Their first child, Emeline Eliza Scofield was born February 12, 1826. She may well have had a great influence on Cyrus. The second Scofield child, also a daughter, Harriet Marion, born February 23, 1828, was the last child born in New York state.

Elias Scofield had become adept at wood-working trades and later reported his occupation as mill-wright to the United States Census. There were undoubtedly more letters from Thomas Goodrich in Michigan than the 1831 one quoted. The western pull was strong, and, in 1833, Elias, Abigail and the two girls left New York State for Michigan. Elias appears to have gone to work with his father-in-law at the mill as soon as the family arrived in Clinton. A third child, Laura Marie Scofield, was born November 3, 1833. Victor Scofield, the first son, born November 7, 1835, lived just over two years. He died November 23, 1837.

On the frontier, death spared neither young nor old. Thomas Goodrich died April 25, 1836, after barely twelve years on his new lands in the "West." When Thomas Goodrich acquired his land on the Raisin River, it was in the old Michigan Territory organized under the Northwest Ordinance of 1787. It was Gov. Lewis Cass who hammered out the Territory of Michigan and organized a government. By 1835, the Territory of Michigan was ready to seek statehood. But a dispute with Ohio over a strip of land between the present Toledo, Ohio, and Monroe, Michigan, and points just to the West, held up admission until the dispute was settled. Admission was finally achieved on January 26, 1837.

During 1837, Elias Scofield decided to obtain his own land. The Goodrich lands had passed to the younger Thomas Goodrich (Abigail's brother); thus it was that on October 8, 1837, Thomas Jr. and his wife Betsy Goodrich conveyed to Scofield title to a plot of land in the Towns of Clinton and Newberg, Lenawee County, Michigan.

A second son, Oscar, was born to the Scofields on April 30, 1838. He also had a short life, dying on June 17, 1840. The fourth and last daughter, Victorine Ophelia Scofield was born on March 15, 1841.

Elias Scofield was dividing his time between woodworking and cultivating his plot of ground. He continued to participate in the lumbering and the working of the sawmill. In the light of the evidence of these trades, it is quite remarkable that in the eulogy written for C. I. Scofield at the time of his death, Luther Rees (a long-time associate

of Rev. Scofield) said that Elias was an officer in the regular Army, stationed near Detroit.[4]

It has not been possible to locate any Army facility in or near Lenawee County. The National Archives has not located any record of military service for Elias Scofield, and in the 1840's Clinton would hardly be considered near Detroit.[5]

The last child of Elias and Abigail Scofield, Cyrus Ingerson Scofield, was born August 19, 1843. Abigail failed to recover from the effects of delivering Cyrus. She must have spent the late summer and early fall in 1843 in a lingering state of illness for she did not die until November 15, 1843.

Elias was left with a motherless babe and four daughters, ages 17, 15, 8 and 3. Emeline probably took charge of the household, and it is likely that the Goodriches and other neighbors helped out until Elias remarried.

Scofield was to relate this story of his boyhood to Charles G. Trumbull when Trumbull was writing his sketches:

> One day, when a little chap six or eight years old, he felt that his many sisters were shamefully neglecting him; so "Bub"—as his sisters called him—and a little friend decided to run away from home.
>
> They traveled all day, and at nightfall they encountered some woodchoppers who hospitably asked them to spend the night before their great log fire. The following morning, somehow, the youngsters did not go farther, but retraced their steps, dirty-faced and homesick. Their stomachs had a sense of need, too; so they decided to stop at a farm-house and ask for something to eat. This they did at several farmhouses, but could not get up courage to ask for more than a drink of water, hoping each time that there might be an accompanying cookie. Nothing but water came their way.
>
> Finally the two little runaways reached home. No special welcome awaited them, for the sisters had decided that they would act as though nothing unusual had happened. The son of the family was quite nonplussed, having expected an enthusiastic welcome.
>
> The boy's father took him on his lap and gave him an extra tight hug, much to the boy's delight. And years afterward the father told him that he had not slept a wink that night when his "wandering boy" was not under the home roof with him.[6]

Not long after the "runaway" incident, Elias brought a stepmother into the home. He married Rebecca Fidela Passeus. Remarkably, Scofield the preacher never mentioned a stepmother.

Most of the genealogical data utilized in this chapter came from records of Congregational chruches in New York State.[7] The Yankees who went West sometimes took their churches with them. The Congregational meeting house, familiar at home, did at times reappear in the newer settlements.

The Elias Scofields must have made a change in churches. In later years, C. I. Scofield was to say that his parents were "nominal Epis-

copalians." It will be noted that his sisters were Episcopal communicants throughout their lives.

The search for additional Scofield details included surviving records of the two Episcopal parishes closest to the Scofield farm. Some records of St. Patrick's Episcopal Church, Clinton, and St. Peter's Episcopal Church, Tecumseh, are in the Bentley Historical Collection of the University of Michigan Library, Ann Arbor. (St. Patrick's parish was merged into St. Peter's in 1844.) Those surviving records do not show the name Scofield in the entire period between Elias' arrival in Michigan in 1833 and the Civil War.[8] Note that in the period we are considering there were births, marriages and deaths, all of which would have been recorded for faithful communicants. Trumbull's use of the term "nominal" is probably accurate.

When C. I. Scofield related the story of his boyhood to Charles G. Trumbull, he said that he had been influenced by a cultured Episcopal rector who was a graduate of Rugby and Oxford in England.[9] The names of rectors who served parishes in Lenawee County in the early 19th century were checked. The list had only one who was born across the Atlantic, the Rev. William Lyster.

The Assistant Archivist of the Archives and Historical Collection of the Episcopal Church History Society (Austin, Texas) read the story as related by Trumbull. She pointed out that William Lyster was born in Ireland, graduated from Trinity College, Dublin, and pursued a theological course at the University of Edinburgh. He was ordained in England. Her comment was that the Trumbull story was "a little scrambled".[10]

Lyster's connection with young Scofield, if Lyster was the one mentioned by Trumbull, was rather limited. Records show that Lyster was rector at Tecumseh only in the 1830's, before Scofield was born. During Scofield's boyhood, Lyster had charges at Cambridge Junction, Michigan; Christ Church, Detroit; and Trinity Church, Monroe, Michigan. He was also a traveling missionary visiting Episcopal churches in Southern Michigan. It is possible that in the latter role he may at times have spent a night in the Scofield residence in Clinton. The contact with young Scofield would have been brief.

In considering the cultural climate which shaped young Scofield, the Episcopal influence may have been the least significant. Scofield's parents had come to maturity in a part of the United States which was stirred by social and religious ferment of remarkable intensity.

The 1831 letter of Thomas Goodrich gives a hint of the way in which some of the fervor touched a family:

> . . . You must write immediately after receiving this & let us know everything about Jefferson County and how anti Masonry this town has been called the Masonic Town But the 4th day of April we tried the test &

> elected the anti Masonic ticket throughout to the mortification of 30 or 40 Brethren of the Mistic Tie We cable tanned the whole with their eyes open.[11]

The center of the Anti-Masonic Movement was along the Erie Canal in New York State. Goodrich's letter gives us a hint that it was more active in "The North Country" than we had previously been aware of. Rev. Jedidiah Morse's revelation of the role of Masonic Lodges in the French Revolution and the disappearance of William Morgan, the exposer of Masonic secrets, were all fresh in people's minds. Goodrich, identified as a strict Baptist, would not have been enthusiastic about the various "wild-Fires" spreading through what is referred to as the "Burned-over District."

The Anti-Masonic furor was but one of many excitements which kept people in Upstate New York so concerned about particular issues that they lost sight of the true vision of America as well as the vision of a Church Triumphant.

Whitney R. Cross related the Upstate New York situation to the movement West:

> Much of the isolation, optimism, crudity, superstition, and credulity characteristic of a young section thus remained during the second quarter of the century. If these were the primary causes of isms, however, western New York should have been much less "burned" than other territories farther west, instead of itself earning the designation, "Burned-over District." In fact, this region during the era of its renowned enthusiasms progressed rapidly from its pioneering characteristics toward new ones of an eastern stamp. The survivals of earlier manners have some part in explaining its habits of mind, but the newer traits seem more important.
>
> Westward migration continued through this area for many years. Some Yankees during the thirties went directly to Michigan or Illinois, but others stopped here to buy out earlier settlers who moved on in turn. Still others had stopped earlier in eastern New York and now moved on within the state. The transients headed for more distant parts were ordinarily the restless, the less educated and propertied, the more optimistic folk, who preferred a rough frontier to the adjustments which civilization required. Ambition for material success when inadequately satisfied in New York drove them on; so they probably ahd less religious inclination that did the persons they left behind, who had achieved a degree of worldly position and could well look to their eternal welfare.[12]

Obviously, we do not know enough about the Goodrichs and the Scofields to make direct application, but this description does establish that there was instability in the social climate in which young Cyrus was molded.

The movement to Michigan had some distinctives which, in molding young Scofield, a lad from a motherless home, may account, for the man of later years. To this we must add the fact that the Scofields were in a new religious milieu running counter to the family conditioning of generations past.

Kevin Phillips, a political commentator, writing in 1968 noted:

> To a degree little appreciated by most Americans, the cultural patterns of the Northeast and the coastal South traveled due west across the pre-Civil War Mississippi Valley so that the county-by-county partisanship of, say, Indiana, can be largely explained in terms of Yankee, Middle Atlantic or Southern settlement. A number of pre-Civil War travelers and observers discussed this phenomenon, and one of the best descriptions is that written in 1834 by a contemporary emigration counselor named Baird: "The emigration to the Valley of the Mississippi seems to have gone in columns, moving from the East almost due West, from the respective state. . . . From New England, the emigrant column advanced through New York, peopling the middle and western parts of that state in its progress; but still continuing, it reached the northern part of Ohio, then Indiana and finally Illinois. A part of the same column . . . is diverging into Michigan. . . .[13]

Baird, quoted by Phillips, continues:

> The above mentioned fact furnished a better key than any other that I know of, to furnish a correct knowledge of the diversity of customs and manners which prevail in the Valley of the Mississippi.[14]

Phillips' point is that the farther north the stream of migration, the more politically liberal it was. The source of this pattern was the Unitarian takeover of church and state in Massachusetts. This is plainly set out in Ernest Gordon's book *The Leaven of The Sadducees*.[14]

The cultural influences which marked the areas where the Scofield family lived, migrated and settled, were subject to influences which make us have some reserve about Trumbull's claim in the opening of his story about the spiritual depth of the parents.[15]

CHAPTER 2 NOTES

1. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 14.
2. Genealogical data for this period of the Scofield family was supplied by Mrs. Ruth Scofield Kennedy of Birmingham, Michigan. Mrs. Kennedy is connected with another branch of the Scofield clan but developed information on Cyrus' ancestors in connection with her own research. The Kammerers of Gettysburg, Pennyslvania, provided additional information.
3. Data from Mrs. Kennedy and the Krammerers.
4. *The Central American Bulletin*, Dallas, Tex., Sept. 15, 1921, p. 118.
5. Letter to the author from the National Archives, Oct. 12, 1976.
6. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
7. Congregational data accumulated by Mrs. Kennedy.
8. The records are preserved in the University of Michigan, Bentley Historical Library, Michigan Historical Collection, Ann Arbor, Michigan. The material was checked for the author by Mary Jo Pugh, Reference Archivist.
9. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 2.
10. Letter from the Episcopal Church Historical Society, Apr. 10, 1978.
11. Letter copied from the original by the Kammerers of Gettysburg, Pa.
12. Whitney R. Cross, *The Burned-Over District*, Harpers, 1950, p. 113 ff.

13. Kevin Phillips, *The Emerging Republican Majority*, Arlington House, New Rochelle, N.Y., 1968. Phillips' analysis of events up to the time of his writing is excellent, especially in pinpointing the role and political complexion of "Limousine Liberals". His role as a political prophet was devastated by the Wonderful Folks who gave us Watergate. Phillips quoted R. Baird, *View of the Valley of the Mississippi*, Philadelphia, 1834, pp. 100–101.
14. E. E. Gordon, *The Leaven of the Sadducees*, Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago, 1926, p. 1.
15. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 3.

CHAPTER 3

The Start of the "French Connection"

"For the joy of human love,
Brother, sister, parent, child,
Friends on earth and friends above,
For all gentle thoughts and mild,
Lord of all, to Thee we raise,
This our hymn of grateful praise."

Folliott S. Pierpont

A wedding was celebrated in Clinton, Michigan, on March 19, 1850. Emeline Eliza Scofield was married to Sylvester Vilray Papin of St. Louis, Missouri. Probably, the ceremony was performed by the Episcopal rector; we cannot be sure, because the parish records are incomplete.

The bridegroom came from one of the prominent French families in St. Louis. The Choteau Clan to which he belonged had played an important part in the fur trade in the West. The original "French Connection" had reached St. Louis from Canada in the years before the American Revolution. By the middle of the 19th century, the clan was firmly in control of the world's major fur market.[1] They had protected their interests by securing land grants from the governments which had exercised nominal sovereignty over the lands west of the Mississippi. After several generations they had successfully blended their French Catholic background with the 19th century Middle Western culture.

Sylvester Papin, born in 1820, originally planned on an Army career. He applied for a commission to West Point; it arrived while he was prostrate with an illness which lasted 14 months, so it had to be declined. On his recovery he became a student of law. By 1847, he was a clerk in the city recorder's office.[2]

The Choteau clan was so prominent in the history of St. Louis that much data on the family has been preserved. But the various sources are silent as to when and where Emeline and Sylvester met. Journey's in the 1840's were not easy. Sylvester's post as a city employee would not require traveling on business, especially to a backwoods corner of Michigan. Unwed girls were less likely to leave home than they are today. The most likely explanation is that after Rebecca came into the Scofield home, Emeline in some way reached St. Louis and met Sylvester.

The relationship between Emeline and Cyrus was extremely important during several crucial periods in Cyrus' life. But except for

statistics, little appears to have survived about the oldest Scofield girl. We do not know her as a person. More knowledge of Emeline's personality might help clear up some details in our study and help round out the picture of Cyrus.

After the wedding the couple settled in St. Louis. They lived in a home on Pine Street between 12th and 13th Streets.[3] By the time the 1851 City Directory for St. Louis came out, Sylvester had been appointed to the post of city register, heading the Department in his office in City Hall.[4] A son, Sylvester Vilray Papin II, was born in 1859.

But back to Michigan.

By the early 1850's, the Scofield homestead in the Town of Newburg had emerged from the pioneer wilderness. Father Elias was involved in working both the sawmill and his land. The house was managed by stepmother Rebecca, helped by three growing girls—virtually young ladies.

Cyrus was at an age where he could handle a lot of chores, that is, if he could work them in between school, hunting and fishing. In an earlier work on Scofield, it is reported that in the evenings the boy Cyrus liked to read in front of the open fire (no doubt only after lessons and chores were finished). The story was that he avidly devoured historical works and even tried to work out a chart system to show world history.[5]

Of course he did his reading in front of the fire. There was no other place in a country farmhouse. In 1939, Dr. Wilbur M. Smith related this comment by Scofield about his boyhood reading:

> I gave much of my earlier life to the study of the two greatest of merely human writers, Homer and Shakespeare, and while my understanding undoubtedly profited by that study and I found keen and intellectual delight in it, these books held no rebuke for my sins, no new power to lift me above them.[6]

This was much more typical of mid-19th century America than the sophisticates have been willing to admit. A reference of Dr. Cornelius Weygandt about finding a copy of *Don Quixote* at an auction of a farm in Pennsylvania is appropriate:

> . . . another bit of evidence to the great mass rolling up everywhere throughout our country to prove that "the States" a hundred years ago were far more cultivated than most of us have realized.[7]

In the mid-1850's, there appeared in Clinton one William Henry Eames, a native of Auburn, New York, trained in dentistry.[8] He started a practice to fill the needs of Lenawee County. He even filled a personal need. Laura Scofield became the object of his affections, and she reciprocated.

A double wedding was held in Clinton on February 4, 1855. There was no regular rector in charge of St. Patrick's at the time, so we do

not know who officiated.[9] Harriet Marion Scofield married Franklin Eastbrook, and Laura Marie Scofield married William Harrison Eames. Harriet lived but a little over a year after her marriage, passing away on February 28, 1856.

William Eames was touched with that American desire to move on, but instead of going West, he went South. He must have felt that more filling opportunities awaited him in Tennessee. On July 15, 1858, he purchased property on Main Street in Lebanon, Wilson County, about 30 miles east of Nashville.[10] Despite assertions in the Dispensational community to the contrary, the Eames, William and Laura, were the only part of the Scofield family connection to establish a home in Tennessee.[11]

In 1859, Rebecca Scofield died leaving Elias a widower for a second time. Rebecca's will filed for probate at Adrian, Michigan, in November includes bequests to Victorine and Cyrus Scofield.[12] Cyrus' failure to mention a stepmother seems a bit of ingratitude.

The 1860 Census shows Elias Scofield living in the Village of Tecumseh, married again, this time to 32-year-old Elizabeth, a native of Vermont.[13] Cyrus, in a letter written in 1862, confirms his father's continued residence in Michigan. Elias remained in Michigan until his death in 1870.

Victorine Scofield was enumerated in the 1860 Census in Wilson County, Tennessee, living with Laura and William.[14] By April 1861, when Sumter was fired upon, Cyrus was "visiting his sister in Tennesse."[15] He never returned to Michigan.

Today Lenawee County remembers as its most famous native son, not Rev. C. I. Scofield, but comedian Danny Thomas.

CHAPTER 3 NOTES

1. *Encyclopedia of the History of St. Louis*, by Hyde & Connard, 1889 in the collection of The Missouri Historical Society, St. Louis.
2. Data supplied by The Missouri Historical Society from City Directories in their collection.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*
5. Trumbull, *op. cit.* p. 1ff.
6. *The Spirit and Method of Bible Study*, Addresses by The Rev. C. I. Scofield, D.D., and The Rev. Wilbur M. Smith, D.D., Silver Anniversary Momento of The Philadelphia School of the Bible, October 1, 1939, p. 34.
7. Cornelius Weygandt, *The Dutch Country*, D. Appleton-Century Co., New York, 1939, p. 97. *The Dutch Country* is one of twelve books by Weygandt (Professor of English at the University of Pennsylvania) describing the culture, lares, penates, flora and fauna of that America which was finally extinguished by World War II.
8. Information supplied by Richard Kammerer.
9. Information on the state of the charge at St. Patrick's from the Bentley Historical Collection, Ann Arbor (supra).
10. Copy of Deed supplied by Registrar of Deeds, Wilson County, Lebanon, Tennessee.

11. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 6, which conflicts with page 7.
12. Copy of will from Register of Wills, Lenawee County, Adrian, Michigan.
13. United States Census for Michigan, 1860, Lenawee County, p. 117.
14. United States Census for Tennessee, 1860, Wilson County, District No. 10, p. 175.
15. Quoted from a letter considered in Chapter 4.

CHAPTER 4

The War Between the States

> *"To every thing there is a season, and to a time to every purpose under heaven . . . a time of war, a time of peace."*
>
> Ecclesiastes 3:1 and 8b

In his days as pastor and Bible teacher, Scofield was to make much of Tennessee "roots." Those roots would have had to be put down during his stay with Laura and William in Wilson County. Historian Donald Davidson describes life in the region just before the start of The War Between The States:

> Middle Tennessee extended from its irregular eastern boundary to the Tennessee River on the west, and included the mountainous Cumberland plateau, the oak barrens of the Highland Rim, and the rich bluegrass basin which was the chief seat of its diversified and highly prosperous agriculture. On the north it had easy commercial access to Louisville and Cincinnati; on the south it linked with North Alabama, and through the gateway of Chattanooga, with Georgia and the Deep South. In Middle Tennessee were more plantations, and yet not many large plantations. The small farmer flourished along with the planter. Like the Bluegrass of Kentucky, the region represented a westward extension of the Virginia tradition, in which the planter set the tone of society and was willing to live up to his responsibilities. Yet he did not make any too absurd pretensions to aristocracy. The rough-and-tumble tradition of Old Hickory and the negligible distance between planter and farmer forbade that. Middle Tennessee was decidedly proslavery, and had some secessionist tendencies, but it liked the Whig program too.[1]

Scofield's exposure to that way of life was limited. It could never have influenced him as Trumbull suggests.[2] The few months he was there could never have countered the cultural molding to which he had exposed in Michigan.

In the material sent by Scofield to Marquis Publishing Company for inclusion in *"Who's Who in America"* in 1912, he claimed that he was preparing privately for entrance to university when the war broke out.[3] For this there is no confirmation. In relating his story to Trumbull, Scofield said that the war closed the schools.

The commitment to war in early 1861 disrupted life in Wilson County. Eventually it led to actual destruction. William Eames' practice of dentistry was destroyed.

Meanwhile, Cyrus, being somewhat at loose ends, followed a pattern noted throughout history; he decided to enlist in the Army. He

was 17, going on 18. He was described as tall, athletic, looking older than his chronological years.[4] At the start of the War, the Confederacy set a minimum age of 21 for military service. This did not bother Scofield. It did not faze hundreds, possibly thousands of others. Giving his age as 21, Scofield enlisted on May 20, 1861, in the 7th Regiment of Tennessee Infantry. He was assigned to Company H, along with other men from Wilson County.[5] This assignment is the only bit of evidence so far located which might support his claim to residence in Wilson County, Tennessee.

The fact that Tennessee was organizing troops and accepting enlistments as early as May 1861, is evidence of popular support for resistance to the North. Tennessee did not adopt its Ordinance of Secession until July 2, 1861.[6]

The story of the 7th Tennessee was included in *Tennessee in the Civil War, Part 1*. Portions are reproduced here with the permission of the Tennessee State Archives and Library, Nashville:

> The regiment was organized at Camp Trousdale, Sumner County, where it was mustered into Confederate service in July, 1861. On July 15 it entrained for Virginia, reaching Staunton, Virginia, on July 25, 1861. Along with the 1st (Maney's) and the 14th Tennessee Infantry Regiments it formed what was known throughout the war as the Tennessee Brigade, Army of Northern Virginia, under Brigadier General Samuel R. Anderson. The 7th and 14th Tennessee were together from the original formation of the brigade until the surrender at Appomattox.
>
> After a stop of several weeks at Big Springs, Virginia, the brigade participated in the unsuccessful Cheat Mountain Campaign in West Virginia.
>
> After the return to Big Springs, they were ordered to join Brigadier General John B. Floyd near Raleigh Courthouse, from there moved to Major General Thomas J. Jackson at Winchester in December, 1861. Here Shumaker's Battery was attached to the brigade. With Jackson, on January 4, 1862, they participated in the expedition to Bath, Virginia, to destroy the railroad bridge near that point.
>
> On February 9, 1862, Maney's 1st was ordered to Tennessee, and the 7th and 14th along with the 3rd Arkansas Infantry were placed in a brigade commanded by Major General Theophilus H. Holmes, commander of the Aquia District. On February 24, 1862 the 7th and 14th were ordered to Manassas to join General Joseph H. Johnston's Army. On March 8, 1862 Turney's 1st Confederate joined the 7th and 14th Regiments to form Anderson's Brigade at Evansport (now Quantico), Virginia. These three Tennessee Regiments remained in the same brigade throughout the war, being the only Tennessee Regiments to spend their entire term of service in the Virignia Theater.[7]

On April 8, 1862, Private Scofield was detached from Company H and entered as a patient in the Chimborazo Hospital in Richmond, Virginia.[8] Records of individual patients and their treatments at this military hospital have not been located. We are not sure of the reason

for his admission. Since it is a matter of record that disease killed more men on both sides of the war than were killed in battle, it is probable that he had taken ill. Further, no mention of a war wound ever appears in the narrations. Scofield returned to duty May 1, 1862.

Whatever bodily ills there were that called for treatment, we must note that his spiritual needs were given little thought. Yet, Chimborazo Hospital had a ministry that was caring for the spiritual needs of the patients right at the time Scofield was there.

In his book *"The Great Revival in The Confederate Army"* William W. Bennett tells of fruitful ministry in that place, and at the time of Scofield's confinement.[9] Bennett quotes a Rev. Joseph P. Martin: "We have lately had sixteen conversions. . . ."[10] This in early 1862, the time of our present concern. Rev. Dr. Ryland reported (as noted by Bennett):

> I have conversed with, addressed, and prayed for many hundreds of invalid soldiers during the month and given each a tract, or a religious newspaper, or a New Testament, and have received from *all* great respect, and from *many* the most tender expressions of gratitude.[11]

Scofield appears to have been unaware of such activity and was at that time unmoved by things spiritual. He returned to duty in time to join his company in the Battle of Seven Pines. The Tennessee archivist reports:

> In May, 1862, Colonel Hatton was promoted to Brigadier General and given command of the brigade. Lieutenant Colonel Goodner was promoted to colonel; Major John K. Howard to lieutenant colonel; and Captain John A. Fite to major. At the Battle of Seven Pines, May 31, 1862, General James J. Archer assumed command of the brigade.
>
> The brigade was placed in Major General Ambrose P. Hill's Division, and in June, 1862, consisted of the 5th Alabama Battalion, 19th Georgia Regiment, 1st, 7th and 14th Tennessee Regiments, and Braxton's Battery. As such it was in the engagements at Mechanicsville and Gaines' Mill June 26–27, where the 7th suffered 72 casualties, and had every field officer either killed or wounded. Here Lieutenant Colonel John K. Howard was killed.[12]

On July 8, 1862, Private Scofield sent the following letter to the Confederate Secretary of War, George H. Randolph (grandson of Thomas Jefferson). The transcription is from the original in the National Archives, Washington, D.C.:[13]

> Hon. Geo. H. Randolph.
> Sir,
>
> Desiring to obtain an exemption from the Conscription Act and an order discharging me from the service of the Confederate States I would respectfully call your attention to the following statement of my reasons and motives.
>
> I am a native of the State of Michigan and my Father still resides there. I am a minor and at the time I entered the service of the South I

was visiting a sister in Tennessee and joined the Seventh Tennessee as a volunteer in May '61. I have never voted in the Confererate States nor in any manner exercised the rights of citizenship. My reasons for wishing discharge are that my health never good is broken by exposure and fatigue in the recent series of engagements with the Enemy before Richmond and I have fought in three battles for the South and have no intention of deserting her cause but after a short time to enter Guerilla service in East Tenn.

Hoping my reasons and motives merit a favorable reply I have the honor to be

Respectfully
Your obdt Servt
Cyrus I. Scofield Co. H 7th Tenn Regt.

The letter is especially interesting because it invalidates the claim made by Trumbull that the family as a whole had located in Wilson County, Tennessee.[14] It specifically declares that Elias was still living in Michigan, most likely in Tecumseh, as noted in the 1860 Census.

The letter was received in Richmond on July 9, 1862, and the wheels of bureaucracy started to spin some red tape, along with actual decision making, of which more anon.

The 7th Tennessee was part of a movement which did not stop for red tape. The archivist notes:

> In August, 1862, Hill's Division was ordered to join Major General T. J. Jackson's Corps, and was in the Battle of Cedar Run on August 9, where the regiment suffered 34 casualties; of Manassas Junction, August 26; and of Manassas Plaines, August 28. At Second Manassas, the regiment was commanded by Major S. G. Shepard.[15]

After Second Manassas (or the Second Battle of Bull Run, as it was called by the federals) the path of the 7th Tennessee led to actions more spectacular than any previously experienced.

CHAPTER 4 NOTES

1. Donald Davidson, *The Tennessee, Frontier to Secession*, Rivers of America Series, Rinehart & Co., New York, 1946, p. 296.
2. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 7.
3. *"Who's Who in America"*, Vol. 7, 1912, Marquis Publishing Co., Chicago.
4. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
5. Company Records in Tennessee State Archives.
6. Dates of the Secession Ordinance are a matter of record. Specific source: Scott's Specialized United States Postage Stamp Catalog, Confederate Section.
7. *Tennesseans in the Civil War, Part 1*, Civil War Centennial Commission, Nashville, 1964, p. 188–190.
8. Confederate Archives, Chap. 6, File 21, p. 40 and File 64, p. 41.
9. W. W. Bennett, *The Great Revival in the Confederate Armies*, 1976, reprint by Sprinkle Publications, Harrisonburg, Va.
10. Bennett, *op. cit.*, p. 80.
11. Bennett, *op. cit.*, p. 152.
12. *Tennesseans in the Civil War*, p. 189.

13. Original in the National Archives, Washington, D.C.
14. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 9
15. *Tennesseans in the Civil War*, p. 189.

CHAPTER 5

Antietam—And All That!

"Thou therefore endure hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ"
II Tim. 2:3

By the end of August 1862, General Robert E. Lee was ready to invade the North. The 7th Tennessee, by then in Major General Ambrose P. Hill's Division and attached once again to Major General T. J. (Stonewall) Jackson's Corps, was one of the regiments in Lee's Army of Northern Virginia.[1]

In Richmond, the bureaucracy, besides spinning out red tape, had taken action on Scofield's letter of July 8, 1862. At the end of August, word reached Company H of the 7th Tennessee that an "alien," a resident of Michigan, was in their midst. Release of Private Scofield was ordered. A note to that effect was entered in Regimental Records on August 30, 1872.[2] The discharge did not take place immediately. It must have seemed the height of folly to release an effective soldier in the face of a major engagement. This was especially true since the Army of Northern Virginia was having difficulty keeping a full compliment of men.

On September 5, 1862, Jackson's Corps, including the 7th Tennessee and Private Scofield, crossed the Potomac at White's Ford, a few miles beyond Leesburg, Virginia and camped on the Maryland side. On the 9th, Lee ordered Jackson to envelop Harper's Ferry from the Virginia side.

The movement of the troops is descriped by John Greenleaf Whittier, an excellent poet who served the Bostonian elite. He wrote:

Up from the meadows rich with corn
Clear in the cool September morn,

The clustered spires of Frederick stand
Green-walled by the hills of Maryland.

Round about the orchards sweep,
Apple and peach tree fruited deep.

Fair as the garden of the Lord
To the eyes of the famished rebel horde,

On that pleasant morn of early fall
When Lee marched over the mountain wall.

Over the mountain winding down,
Horse and foot into Frederick town. . . .[3]

The poem goes on to describe, as Whittier understood it, the march of the troops, including the 7th Tennessee, Company H, and Private Scofield. But Whittier made central to his poem an incident which did *not* occur as the troops marched up Patrick Street. Whittier claimed that an American (Union) Flag displayed by one Barbara Frietchie was shot off its staff. It was allegedly recovered by Barbara who berated Jackson. Jackson in turn, supposedly ordered the flag respected by his troops. The poem was for years taught to every schoolchild outside the South.[4]

Despite the wide circulation of the Frietchie story in his day, we do not find Scofield mentioning it, for it never happened. Fact is that Mrs. Frietchie was not even in Frederick on the day Jackson marched through. A Mrs. Mary S. Quantrell did display a flag, but neither Jackson nor his men took any notice of it, and Mrs. Quantrell never met a Bostonian poet.

The troops passed through Frederick and camped within a mile of Boonsboro. Late in the day, they had a brush with a squadron of Federal Calvary. Next morning (the 11th) the troops moved to Williamsport. Here they reforded the Potomac. A. P. Hill took the direct turnpike while Jackson took a side road to approach Martinsburg from the west. As Jackson and Hill approached, the Federals left Martinsburg and crowded into the blind alley which was Harper's Ferry.

On the morning of the 12th, the Confederates entered Martinsburg, Virginia (new West Virginia). Jackson was greeted with enthusiasm and secured the sympathies of the residents. Stonewall was not deflected from his purpose by the blandishments of Martinsburg society. He departed late the same day in the direction of Harper's Ferry. On the 13th, Bolivar Heights was invested and the town of Harper's Ferry surrendered.

Late on the 14th, A. P. Hill gained a foothold on the enemy's left and placed some artillery at the base of Loudon Heights on the right bank of the Shenandoah River. Scofield was reported to have been an orderly. No doubt he was extremely busy during this action. The investiture was successful. On Monday, Harper's Ferry surrendered. Jackson left Hill in charge at the Ferry. He headed toward Sharpsburg to reinforce Lee who was facing McClellan at Antietam Creek.

It was not until the morning of the 17th that A. P. Hill was able to get away from Harper's Ferry with three brigades and 2,500 men. Meanwhile General Ambrose Burnside, with a corps of 14,000 men, had been waiting to make an advance. Around 1 o'clock he crossed the bridge which now bears his name. By 3 o'clock he was ready to advance against the feeble line of Confederates opposing the Union hordes.

A. P. Hill had been marching his men over the 17 miles from Harper's Ferry, Private Scofield among them. They had started the day by wading across the Potomac. By the time they neared Antietam

Creek, they were tired and footsore. Just as Burnside's advance began to roll, Hill, picturesque in his red battle shirt, appeared with 2,500 men.

Hill was always strongest at the critical moment. Advanced with his battle flags, his line moved forward. General D. P. Jones with a brigade of 2,500 men had been bearing the brunt of Burnside's push. As Hill's men advanced, Jones and his troops rallied. In the din of musketry and artillery on both flanks, the Federals broke over the field. Hill without waiting for other brigades, met the blue line and stayed it. The blue hesitated and by hesitating were lost. Burnside was driven back to the Antietam and under the shelter of his heavy guns. As the day ended it was evident that Hill again had struck with the hand of Mars.[5]

With the conclusion of the battle, a deathly silence descended on the scene. Both sides were too exhausted to do more than hunt four wounded and dying. Lee had no choice but to return to Virginia. On the 19th, he led his troops across the Potomac at Boteler's Ford (Shepherdstown).

As Lincoln often painfully noted, the Federals usually made no attempt to pursue the Confederates after a major engagement. And most modern histories so report this battle, However, Antietam was different. Fritz-John Porter's Corps had been held back and on the 19th were fresh and rested. Someone, possibly someone outranking McClellan, sent Porter after the retreating Confederates. Late on the 19th he reached the Potomac at Boteler's Ford and engaged General Pendleton who was covering Lee's rear.

Pendleton lost some artillery to Porter's men. Seeing his danger, he sent word to Lee and Lee dispatched A. P. Hill to support Pendleton. With Hill were the remains of the 7th Tennessee. The Confederates had the advantage of position. Rushing down the slope on the Virignia side, they forced the Federals into the River at the Ford and scored a victory over Porter, ending the threat to Lee's movement.

Shepherdstown (Boteler's Ford) was the last engagement in which Scofield was involved. But he never mentioned it.[6] The 7th Tennessee had gone into Maryland with effectives numbering less than 100. Of that number, over 30 were killed or wounded at Sharpsburg. The remains of the regiment, after Shepherdstown, made its way back to Martinsburg to rest and recuperate.

Settled at Martinsburg, on the 26th of September, the Regiment took care of some "business." Lt. Andrew Allison issued a certificate of discharge to Pvt. C. I. Scofield of Company H. The certificate noted that Scofield was under age, not a citizen of the Confederacy, but an alien friend. It also noted that his enlistment had been but for one year.[7]

Scofield was given a mileage allowance for his return to Tennessee. The certificate of discharge is the last entry located in the Confederate records regarding Cyrus Ingerson Scofield.

In later years when Scofield had become well known as a Bible teacher, he allowed to circulate a story that he was decorated for bravery at Antietam.[7] Typically, Trumbull says, "The Cross of Honor was awarded to him for bravery at Antietam."[8] Note first that Antietam was not a Confederate term. The Confederates referred to the engagements of the war by the name of the nearest town, in this case Sharpsburg. The use of the name of the watercourse was a Federal practice. Thus if the statement had been correct it would have said: "The Cross of Honor was awarded to him for bravery at Sharpsburg."

Then the statement creates the image of a commander or even Jeff Davis, the President, calling together a group of brave soldiers and presenting to them medals for acts during the battle. This did not happen.

The simple fact is that, except for one instance which took place some time after Scofield left the Confedereate service, the Confederacy gave *no* decorations for bravery.[9] Luxuries like decorations were something that the hard-pressed Confederacy could hardly afford. Actually, reports of the battle at Antietam Creek make no mention of decorations being given by either side as a result of the action in September 1862. Typical is the very recent study, *The Landscape Turned Red, The Battle of Antietam*, by Stephen W. Sears (1983) which, while relating the battle in detail, omits reference to any decoration.

Note also that the Cross of Honor was not an award of the Confederate government. After The United Daughters of the Confederacy (the women's group) was organized and functioning, it decided to give recognition to those who had served the South honorably during The War Between The States.[10] It was not until 1900, 38 years after Sharpsburg, that the UDC started going through the records to seek out veterans or their survivors in order to present the Crosses.

The official description of the award as supplied by the UDC is:

> The Cross of Honor dated 1861-1865. Foreground: A Crusader Cross in bold relief, each bound to the other by the Battle Flag of the Confederacy and linked by the entwined monogram, UDC, to ribbon. It is attached to a laurel leaf as a special mark of valor for those who distinguished themselves in feats of courage. The color of the ribbon signifies the war in which recipient served. The Bronze dolphin or star indicate Overseas Service. Motto: 'Fortes Creantur Fortibus'—'The brave beget the brave'. Crosses of Military Service are the most prized awards bestowed by the United Daughters of the Confederacy. Guard it safely, wear it proudly. It represents your Confederate Heritage and your patriotism and service to your Country in time of war.[11]

While it is evident that the UDC wanted to reward the brave fight of the men in Grey, it was not quite a decoration in the manner usually

described in Scofield biographical comments. And note that the apparent discrepancy arose in the period when Scofield, a noted Bible teacher, was preparing to start work on the Scofield Notes for which he was to become world famous.

Scofield's spiritual apathy at Sharpsburg-Antietam contrasts sharply with incidents reported by Bennett. Bennett gives us a report of Rev. W. J. Mills, Chaplain of the Florida Regiment:

> A young man said to me after the battle (Sharpsburg): "When I was going through the battle, I put my trust in God, and he has brought me through untouched, and I am grateful to Him." And the tears stood in his eyes as he spoke. He was an uncoverted man when he went into the fight. Last night at preaching, while referring to the incidents of the battle and how God preserved them, many tears fell, and many countenances spoke louder than words undying gratitude to the God of all grace.[12]

CHAPTER 5 NOTES

1. *Tennesseans in the Civil War*, p. 189.
2. The note was placed on the Discharge Certificate.
3. "Barbara Frietchie," by John Greenleaf Whittier, in *Whittier's Poems*, Tickner and Fields, Boston.
4. In an article of July 21, 1886, in the *Philadelphia Times*, the story of Barbara Frietchie was completely exploded by reporter George Seilheimer. When faced with the evidence produced by Seilheimer, Whittier refused to withdraw the poem, but insisted on its credibility. Note that in the poem, Whittier was quite hard on Stonewall Jackson, part of the Bostonian effort to downgrade the Confederacy and all those associated with it.
5. The story of the troop movements (and that of Barbara Frietchie) was based on material in *North to Antietam, Battles and Leaders of the Civil War*, Vol. II, Thomas Yoseloof, New York, 1936. Also, *The War Without Grant*, by Col. Robert R. McCormick, Wheelwright, New York, 1950, Chap. IX. Also the works of the Civil War by Carl Sandburg and Bruce Caton.
6. Shepherdstown (Boteler's Ford), the last action in which we have any assurance Scofield was involved, is the "mystery engagement" of the war. It may have been ordered directly from Washington to produce a "real victory" to justify Lincoln's issuing of the Emancipation Proclamation. Since it was in no way a success, it has been passed over, virtually unnoticed by historians until recently. That the mature Scofield failed to mention it could be one of the indications that Scofield was quite well aware of what "The Establishment" wanted.
7. For example: A. C. Gaebelein, *The Story of The Scofield Bible*, Moody Monthly, October 1942, p. 1928, later in book form by Our Hope, New York; Frank Gaebelein, *The Story of the Scofield Reference Bible*; BeVier, *op, cit.*, p. 7; Charles Kenney, *Rev. C.I. Scofield, D.D., Soldier, Lawyer, Pastor, Author*, The Gospel Herald, 1934; Warren Wiersbe, *Insight, Scofield and Ryrie*, Moody Monthly, February 1977, Vol. 77, No. 6, p. 125.
8. Trumbull, *op. cit.* This was related to Trumbull by Scofield but is at variance with fact.
9. Col. Harold B. Simpson, Confederate Research Center, Hillsboro, Texas, advised the writer in a letter dated June 1, 1976: "The Cross of Honor to my knowledge was given by the UDC to Confederate veterans. There was no CSA decoration by this designation. In fact, the *only* Confederate medal struck for valor was the so-called

Jefferson Davis medal awarded to Lieut. Dick Dowling and 46 others for the defense of Sabine Pass in September 1863."

10. In a card dated May 28, 1976, Mrs. K. F. Crippen, Office Mgr. The United Daughters of the Confederacy, advised that the first Southern Cross of Honor was bestowed on April 26, 1900, more than 37 years after Sharpsburg-Antietam.
11. The description of the decoration is from a circular from the UDC.
12. Bennett, *op. cit.*, p. 201.

CHAPTER 6

In Between

"Behold I shew you a mystery!"

I Cor. 15:51a

As September 1862 came to a close, 19-year-old Cyrus Scofield was somewhere in Virginia. Discharged from the Confederate Army, at his own request, he had his mustering out pay, in Confederate money, of course. The mileage allowance for return to Tennessee could not be fully used as intended. Nashville and Lebanon were in Federal hands.

To get from Martinsburg to almost anywhere else in the Confederacy, Scofield had to make his way up the Shenandoah Valley and then to Richmond. In Richmond, there was no ceremony awarding a medal for valor in 1862 nor any other occasion before the debacle in 1865.

Actually, from the day the Discharge Certificate was issued at Martinsburg until an event in St. Louis about four years later, not a single definite record of where young Scofield was or what he did has been located. We consider it probable that the desire to become a guerrilla was not fulfilled. Recurring bouts of illness, prevailing event into the 20th Century, suggest that his health never did really recover (as he had hoped in his letter to Secretary Randolph).[1] It is unlikely that during the war years he was strong enough for a guerrilla role. East Tennessee was a hot-bed of pro-Union sentiment inside the Confederacy. It would have been suicide for a Confederate guerrilla to be operating with papers indicating Union citizenship. And we have no stories describing how the hand of Providence operated to protect a guerrilla in East Tennessee so that the Scofield Bible might be given to the world in years to come. A term as guerrilla should have provided a quiver full of such instances.

Stories did circulate that Scofield served in the Army of Northern Virginia until the end of the war. For instance, BeVier refers to sources, all really secondary, which declare that Scofield's military service lasted until 1865.[2] The references are in material written before Trumbull, but based either on interviews with Scofield or on stories circulated during his ministry. Trumbull, while repeating the story of service throughout the war, introduces, possibly inadvertently, a note which may support the blank in official records. On page 8 of his book, he wrote, "Before he was nineteen young Scofield had been under fire in eighteen battles and major engagements."[3] Scofield had become 19 while

in the Army was in Virginia preparing to enter Maryland, just after Second Manassas. The "eighteen" engagements conforms to the record of the 7th Tennessee. That Trumbull mentions no action after Antietam (he should have called it "Sharpsburg") seem to confirm that there was no further military service by Scofield after the discharge of September 26, 1862.

Scofield does not really help to clear waters which at that point are quite muddied. In 1904 he addressed a gathering of Confederate veterans in Dallas.[4] We know of the address only in the form of sermon notes.[5] There is a reference to his first glimpse of Gen. Stonewall Jackson. All personal references are to the days prior to Sharpsburg. The few references to the later days of the war are to matters of general knowledge which could have been picked up from books or periodicals. On the second page of his notes, we find:

> Since Gustavus Adolphus
> Cromwell no army so many converted men
> Northern Virginia 63–64.

This refers to an aspect of the war conventiently left out of official and establishment histories. A revival of almost unprecedented proportions took place in The Army of Northern Virginia in 1863 and 1864. The sermon notes are correct—there had been nothing like it since the early days of Cromwell's command. But Scofield's reference to the Confederate Revival could have been picked up second hand, rather than by being observed first hand by him, even as a scoffer.

Mention has been made of *The Great Revival in the Confederate Armies*, by William W. Bennett.[6] Originally issued in 1877, this could have been the source of Scofield's comment on the revival. It would have been required reading for any cleric who wanted to keep up a "Confederate image".

Probably the Scofield of 1863 was neither receptive to nor touched by the Confederate Revival, especially in light of his lifestyle in the 1870's. He admitted that prior to his conversion in 1870 he was ignorant of things Christian. In the war years, he was either hardened against the Gospel to an intense degree or else was on some adventure that kept him away from the blessing.

Bennett notes, in a chapter headed "Autumn of 1862" (a date immediately after Scofield's discharge):

> The revival, at this period of the war, was undoubtedly greater and more glorious in the army in Virginia than in any other portion of the Confederacy. . . .[7]

Even the impending collapse of the Confederacy in 1865 failed to cut off blessing. Bennett again is our authority:

> Up to January 1865, it was estimated that nearly *one hundred and fifty thousand* soldiers had been converted during the progress of the war, and it was believed that fully one-third of all soldiers in the field were praying men and members of some branch of the Christian Church.[8]

None of this appears to have touched young Scofield, supporting our contention that he was not directly exposed.

BeVier assumed that Scofield's service did continue, but in some regiment whose record-keeping was incomplete.[9] However, Col. Harold B. Simpson of the Confederate Research Center in Hillsboro, Texas, advised the writer that up to December, 1864, records of The Army of Northern Virginia were substantially accurate. This is where Scofield claimed to be serving, yet his name is not listed in any Army of Northern Virginia records after September 1862. It is probable that the claim of service right up to the time of surrender at Appomattox lacks factual support.

However, consider Scofield's status if he stayed in the Confederacy and was not in the military. His papers identified him as a citizen of the Union, an "alien friend." At the start of the war, the Confederacy issued an order that:

> Every male alien of fourteen years or over was ordered to leave the Confederacy within forty days, suffer expulsion, or be treated as a prisoner of war. If he returned, he was to be treated as a spy. The law defined as aliens all citizens of the United States who acknowledged Federal authority or declared alliegance to it.[10]

On the basis of his Discharge Certificate, Scofield could have been in trouble. False papers may have come from somewhere.

At one point in his story, Trumbull relates as a "Confederate reminiscence" a story involving Scofield and Senator Roscoe Conkling (R-N.Y.) at a formal dinner in Washington.[11] But Conkling did not become a senator until 1867. (The Conkling incident will be considered in later chapters). The unsatisfactory reporting by Trumbull at this point may indicate an effort to cover a hint that slipped out that Scofield was crossing Union lines, in and out of Washington during the war.

If Scofield was 12 miles from Appomattox (as he told Trumbull) on April 9, 1865, his role would *not* have been one that required a uniform of faded, frayed butternut.[12] Scofield was undoubtedly an accomplished story teller. He may have regaled Trumbull with a plethora of stories about the war, entirely factual. There may have been a number of crossings into Washington between September 1862 and April 1865. If so, he would have been carrying false papers and could have been in a role that Trumbull feared would not have enhanced the Dispensational image. In the interest of "image-building," the Conkling story was slipped into the edited narrative, but it got in out of chronological order.

While we really do not know where Cyrus was and what he was doing, we do have some idea of how the war affected some other members of the family. As Grant moved south, there was a northward movement into St. Louis and other border cities. From the story of St. Louisan James B. Eads, we learn of the situation in St. Louis:

> Even more distressing were the homeless, wandering refugees who trickled incessantly into town from the invaded southern territory, sent north by the Union generals because they had become "a serious impediment to military movements." They landed from boats, herding together at the wharves; they came in wagons and hastily fashioned carts, they plodded afoot, their worldly goods in bundles slung over their shoulders, babies in the arms of stumbling women. Nothing, it seemed to James Eads, had ever pulled at his sympathy like this human flotsam. It had been streaming here for months. "The greatness of their numbers appalled us, one St. Louisan wrote of the refugees."[13]
>
> The burden of providing for them had, at first, been thrown by the War Department upon local southern sympathizers, but James Eads had protested against this, reminding the military authorities that the war as "an accursed contest between brothers." He had put a check for a thousand dollars in his letter to start a fund for the homeless. After that, a Sanitary Commission had been organized to provide refugee care. This care was meager enough, funds were always running out, and the tragedy of the haggard newcomers weighed upon the heart of the tired boatbuilder as he went his rounds in quest of money or credit.[14]

In the more progressive, socially minded 20th Century, this sort of thing has become so commonplace that it hardly causes raised eyebrows.[15] That it could happen in the United States in the mid-19th Century indicates how far the American Dream had already been prostituted. Much of the responsibility for this may be placed on "The Secret Six" and their aims.[16]

Among the refugees were the William Eames family and Victorine Scofield. Still extant is the pass issued by the Federals to give the Eames safe passage northward. Whatever hardships were endured between Lebanon, Tennessee, and St. Louis, there were relatives in St. Louis who could help William, Laura, the children and Victorine. Sylvester and Emeline Papin may have put the refugees up temporarily and assisted in getting them settled.

William Eames opened an office for the practice of dentistry in 1863. The evacuation had not been without tragedy for the Eames. Their third child, James, died on March 15, 1863, only 17 months old. Childhood ailments could have been aggravated by the hardships of the trek north from Tennessee. The day that little James passed away, Laura Scofield Eames was confined. On the 14th she had given birth to their fourth child, Harriet Loretta Eames, who lived until 1944. Victorine Scofield was married on July 23, 1863 to Thomas B. Annan. Thus the effects of the evacuation were sloughed off with the passage of time, and St. Louis became the focal point of family interest.

The shooting of President Lincoln on April 14, 1865, undoubtedly on someone's orders, was a dramatic announcement that the war was ended and the country embarking on a new phase of existence.[17] Otto J. Scott says of the end:

> A half-million dead and a million crippled was a heavy price, but the people paid even more. The South was in ruins and the relations between the races disrupted beyond words, while the voice of *The Liberator*, Garrison, said the anti-slavery cause was won.[18]

The end of a war usually means that the men who fought and survived turn their thoughts toward home. But, for young Scofield, where was home? Despite has later claims of roots in and loyalty for Tennessee, he had no real ties left there, nor would conditions in Wilson County have been attractive. Historian Donald Davidson has described the area in 1865:

> By the end of the war Tennessee property, by one reliable estimate, was reduced fifty per cent in taxable value. But such an estimate was hardly a measure of the damage. Physical establishments of every kind, in country, town and city, had suffered even where they had escaped gunfire or the torch. Homes had undergone the abuses of military residence or had deteriorated from vacancy or lack of repairs. School buildings, colleges, churches, courthouses, asylums had been wrecked or damaged by their appropriation for use as barracks and hospitals. Often they had been the center of hot fighting. Railroads were patched up, worn-out remainders except where they had been maintained by the Federal army for its own purposes. Turnpikes were battered, and highway bridges were gone. Mills and factories had been burned, or essential parts of their machinery had been destroyed or carried off. Fences had largely gone to make campfires or hasty breastworks.[19]

Not the place for a young man with ambitions.

Lenawee County may have seemed something of a backwater. Elias' residence, with a stepmother closer in age to Cyrus than to Elias, could have meant a most uncomfortable situation.

The presence of three sisters and their husbands in St. Louis, one husband having roots as deep as the city itself, made Cyrus' choice easier. It was evident that in St. Louis there were connections that would help Cyrus get started on his way in the world.

It was in St. Louis that the first definite date in Scofield's life after Martinsburg, four years earlier, was entered in official records. That date was September 21, 1866.

CHAPTER 6 NOTES

1. The letter is referred to in Chapter 4.
2. William A. BeVier, *A Biographical Sketch of C. I. Scofield*, p. 7. BeVier here cites *The Congregational Year-book Statistics for 1921*, Eleanore W. Nichols, Ed., The Jordan and More Press, Boston, p. 482: "Scofield served as a private, Company H, 7th Tennessee Infantry in the Army of Northern Virginia under General Lee; was

decorated with the Confederate Cross of Honor." This citation correctly relates the facts of record, but in a manner which gives an impression quite at variance with fact for the casual reader. Typically, Scofield was no closer to Lee during his Service than most GI's were to Eisenhower during World War II.

BeVier also notes that L. D. Hill wrote in 1901: "Scofield fought in the 7th Tennessee Regiment in all of the great battles of this great fighting body (including Gettysburg), and served throughout the war." (L. D. Hill and Philip Lindsley, *A History of Great Dallas and Vicinity*, 2 vols., The Lewis Publishing Company, Chicago, 1909, p. 282.) The assertion by Hill and Lindsley is contrary to fact. Scofield was not in the 7th Tennessee after September 1862.

BeVier cites Frank Gaebelein as saying that Scofield "served throughout the Civil War with distinction, being awarded the Confederate Cross of Honor." (Frank Gaebelein, *The Story of the Scofield Reference Bible*, Oxford University Press, 1959, p. 7.) Actually, the Gaebeleins, father and son, can be shown to be quite careless in recording facts about the man who introduced the systems so important to their beliefs and ministries.

Note that BeVier's sources here all secondary sources, depending largely on Scofield himself. They are not confirmed by data in official record sources. BeVier himself may not be entirely sure. He concluded this part of his theses with: "... and it may be Trumbull's account, which Scofield approved and which was published during his lifetime is accurate." (BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 8.) Although BeVier is not quite convinced, he assumed that Trumbull was a reliable source and accepts the line approved by the Dispensational Establishment, a line which conflicts with official records.

3. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
4. The date of the gathering has not been established and the full text does not appear to have been published.
5. Notes of this talk are among Scofield sermon notes in the Moodyiana Collection, Moody Bible Institute, Chicago. Material donated by the Rev. Wendell P. Loveless.
6. See Chapter 4. The book was reissued in 1976 by Sprinkle Publications, Harrisonburg, Virginia.
7. Bennett, *op. cit.*, p. 211.
8. Bennett, *op. cit.*, p. 8,9.
9. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

9a. Letter from Col. Harold B. Simpson to the writer, June 1, 1976.

10. Quoted from Judah P. Benjamin by S. I. Neiman, Bobbs Merrill, Indianapolis, 1963, p. 113.
11. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 128.
12. Trumbull on pages 8 and 9, places Scofield 12 miles from Appomattox, but does not indicate which side of the lines he was on.
13. Anderson, Galusha, *The Story of a Border City During the Civil War*, Boston, 1908, as quoted by Florence Dorsey in work referred to in *Road to the Sea, The Story of James B. Eads*, Rinehart and Company, New York, 1947.
14. Dorsey, *op. cit.*, p. 82.
15. Typically, the displacement of Germans from the areas ceded to Poland in 1945. See *Nemesis at Potsdam*, by Alfred M. de Zayas, Routledge and Keegan Paul, London, 1977.
16. "The Secret Six" were Rev. Theodore Parker, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, George Luther Stearns, Frank Benjamin Sanborn, Samuel Gridley Howe and Gerrit Smith. Except for Smith who was an upstate New York man, they were respectable "proper" Bostonians whose money made it possible for them to, by propaganda and hired assassins, push the issue of abolition of slavery to a breaking point without regard for consequences or effect, merely to impose their own wills on others. The story is

told in *The Secret Six, John Brown and the Abolionist Movement*, by Otto J. Scott, Times Books, New York, 1979. The Secret Six were at various times aided morally and actually by Senator Charles Sumner, Ralph Waldo Emerson and Henry David Thoreau. John Brown of Ossawattomie and Haper's Ferry was their best known tool. Some of their henchmen were in a few years to nurture the fledgling Scofield in politics in Kansas.

17. Both Louis Weichmann who was involved directly in the assassination drama and Chicago chemist-historian Otto Eisenschmil who has done definitive research on the assassination, place major blame on Lincoln's Secretary of War, Edwin M. Stanton, but offer no hint of Stanton's possible encouragement by others. Samuel Carter III notes in *Yankee* Magazine, Feburary 1976, a meeting early in 1865 between Samuel Gridley Howe (one of The Secret Six) and John Wilkes Booth. That may have been only because of Howe's interest in the theatre. But since Howe had firm ideas about the social value of assassination for political gain and also flexible moral values, we cannot be sure of the innocence of the meeting.
18. Otto J. Scott, *op. cit.*, p. 320. In concluding his story, Scott says of The Secret Six, "They were, of course, fools. Their rejection of the accumulated wisdom of the human race led them to repeat ancient follies and to inspire others down grisly paths toward goals they considered noble. Their tactics were closely watched from Europe, and later emulated." "As to the movement they spawned, its rhetoric is lofty and its methods base, but—despite noisy triumphs—its destiny is doomed by its dead fruit."
19. *The Tennessee, Vol. II, Civil War to TVA*, by Donald Davidson, "The Rivers of America Series", Rinehart & Co., New York, 1948 p. 108.

CHAPTER 7

Scofield's French Connection

"There are three things which are too wonderful for me, yea, four which I know not: . . . and the way of a man with a maid."
Prov. 30:18,19b

In 1865, the year Cyrus located there, St. Louis was the world's center for the fur trade. John Jacob Astor had returned the trade to the French families who had dominated the activity in the days when St. Louis was under the Fleur-de-lis.[1] Scofield's connection with a branch of the Choteau Clan, of fur trade fame, gave him an entry into a way of life far different from the old frontier conditions of Lenawee County or the leisurely pattern of pre-War Wilson County.

Since much of the fur was used by fashionable Parisian furriers, ties with France were extremely close. Both fashions and ideas current along the Seine reached St. Louis with amazing rapidity. (This was the Paris of the latter days of Napoleon III and Eugenie.) Scofield, moving in a group which tried to keep abreast of developments in Paris, soon learned French. He is reputed to have retained proficiency in that language to the end of his life. The possibility must not be overlooked that radical ideas, not readily acceptable to Napoleon III, could have been safely exported to St. Louis along with fasion designs.[2]

When Scofield reached St. Louis, his brother-in-law, Sylvester Papin, was president of the St. Louis Board of Assessors.[3] Thus, he had connections which could open many doors for his younger brother-in-law. He chose to place Cyrus in his own office where he could direct the course of Cyrus's training for a career in the law. Cyrus was thus given a great advantage in his start in the law, but we must consider it a case of pure, simple nepotism.

In view of later events, Sylvester may have felt that Cyrus as a lawyer would be of value to the Papin-Choteau Clan in legal matters connected with their many business activities.

With the tide of westward migration pushing the frontier toward the setting sun, it was becoming evident that the fur trade would not be a permanent source of either current income or lasting wealth. The interest of the Choteau Clan and its branches was shifting toward capitalizing on the lands to which they had been given vague titles long before the American flag flew over "The Great American Desert."[1]

If the hint in Trumbull reflects actuality,[4] that Confederate Scofield was in Washington during the days when Grant was moving south,[5]

he would have had contacts at a very high level. Since Washington had to be considered in turning French and Spanish land grants into merchantable American land titles, Scofield may have had potential usefulness to the clan beyond what he himself imagined.

It should be noted that in the 1860's, none of the "Learned Professions," law included, were the "closed shops" they are today. So while Scofield could be earning at least a nominal wage for tasks performed around the assessors office, he started to become familiar with the law, especially regarding land grants, titles, deeds and conveyances.

In Trumbull, we note:

> In order to get together money for his legal education, he started in at once as a clerk in an office for the examination of land titles—a line closely related to the law. . . . After less than two years' work in this office, his devotion to this technical branch resulted in his appointment as chief clerk, being chosen from among the considerable number of young men in the office.[6]

Since most lawyers, especially away from the Seaboard, obtained their education in practice, not classroom, we hold that Scofield (and Sylvester) never contemplated law school. Trumbull was writing and thinking in terms of the 20th Century, and without deprecating Scofield's diligence at his work, it is only realistic to see the hand of Sylvester in the promotion.

Trumbull, on the same page of his work, implies that Scofield's further apprenticeship was served in the office of a practicing law firm, a point not confirmed by available records. It is also suggested that Scofield with great nobility declined an offer of financial assistance from Sylvester.

Sylvester and Emeline were living on Dillon Street near Hickory. No doubt Cyrus had a room there when he first arrived from the war and other related endeavors.

The "open shop" attitude which prevailed in those days made it possible for Scofield to engage in legal matters quite soon. Case 0 3887 of the Circuit Court of St. Louis County, December Term, 1866, included the name of Cyrus I. Scofield in the action of William H. Powers to recover the sum of $1,600 for goods and merchandise delivered to Owen Clary and Company.[7] This is the first note of a legal career that was to burn out rather quickly, like a spent rocket.

Scofield's life was not all work. In the typically French society, there were dinners, dances, parties. It wasn't long before he met Leontine Cerré, youngest daugher of widowed Helene LeBreau Cerré. The Cerré's were one of the prominent French families and part of the "clan." Besides the widow and Leontime, the household at 139 S. Fourth Street included son Henry and another daughter, Sara-Helene.[8]

Leontine's grandfather, Jean Gabriel Cerré was born in Montreal, August 12, 1734. By 1755 he was established at Kaskaskia (Little Paris

in the Wilderness) in what is now Illinois. In 1764, he married Catharine Giard, of a family established in Kaskaskia since at least 1729. In 1778, Jean Gabriel Cerré had a confrontation with George Rogers Clark. Clark had been told that Cerré was an enemy. However, Clark secured Cerrś's good will. (Later Clark devoted ½5th of his memoirs to the adventures with Cerré.) While Cerré accepted Clark's amnesty in 1778, he soon moved to St. Louis outside American jurisdiction and bought, on July 17, 1779, Block 13 of the Village of St. Louis, being the block bounded by the Mississippi River and what are now Main and Vine Streets and Washington Avenue.[9]

Records indicate that he was a responsible man of affairs during the last years of the French and Spanish regimes. Cerré lived to see the Stars and Stripes fly over St. Louis, dying on the 4th of April 1805.[10]

His son, Michael Sylvestre Cerré, Leontine's father, was born in St. Louis April 17, 1803. He accompanied Col. Bonneville on his exploration of the West and was noted by Washington Irving in his relation of the expedition. On April 10, 1839, he married Marie Helene LeBeau (born January 17, 1819).

Michael Cerré served in the Missouri Legislature, was Clerk of the Circuit Court and at the time of his death was Sheriff of both St. Louis City and County. His obituary, in the St. Louis Daily Evening News of January 5, 1860, gives us a picture of the man:

> Mr. Cerré was very generally known to and esteemed by our citizens. He was a native of St. Louis and a member of one of its oldest and most respectable families. He was one of the early fur traders here, and among the first of those who visited New Mexico for the purpose of trade. He could relate many interesting incidents of his experience of life on the plains and in the mountains at that day, when the region which he roamed through had scarcely yet felt the pressure of the foot of the white man. For some years past he has been retired from regular business, devoting his attention to the care of his property, and occasionally serving in offices to which the partiality of his fellow citizens had called him. He was a person of active temperament and habits. His disposition was kindly and his manners frank and cordial. All those who were brought in near and friendly relations to him felt a warm attachment for him. It is not often that a community loses from its midst one who[se loss] is more regretted.[11]

Leontine Cerré, born October 27, 1847, was evidently quite taken by the dashing young Tennessean from Michigan named Scofield. His Army discharge of four years earlier, given the following description: "five feet eleven inches high florid complexion hazel eyes."[12] There was probably little noticeable change by 1866. The romance between Cyrus and Leontine developed into an engagement, then marriage. The nuptuals were solemnized on September 21, 1866, before a justice of the peace. A civil marriage ceremony was probably required since Scofield

as a non-Catholic could not be a party to a full nuptual mass in conformity with the strict Catholic standards of the day. Being a non-Catholic was apparently no bar to Scofield's acceptance by the clan. The lack of religious ceremony seemed to bother no one at the time.[13]

Cyrus and Leontine first lived at the northeast corner of 7th and Pine Streets in St. Louis.[14] But the couple may not have been any more settled than modern young executive couples. Their first child, Abigail Leontine Terese Scofield, was born July 13, 1867, in St. Joseph, all the way across the State of Missouri.

Since Victorian ladies rarely did much, if any, traveling while pregnant, it seems probable that the couple were located in St. Joseph at the time. The first name of the little girl honored Cyrus' mother, the second, his wife. She was to use Abigail and be more familiarly known as Abbie.

Abigail was baptized July 28, 1867, in St. Joseph's Cathedral, St. Joseph, Missouri. The godfather was Sylvester, Cyrus' brother-in-law; the godmother was Sara-Helene, Leontime's sister.

By the time the next child arrived in October 1869, the Scofields were back in St. Louis, but involved in relocating to Atchison, Kansas. Marie Helene was baptized October 17th in St. Therese de Avilla Church, St. Louis. William Henry Eames and Valentin Butterfield were sponsors.

Eames and his wife, the former Laura Scofield, had endured displacement during The War Between The States. They were never mentioned by Scofield in relating the story of his life. Dr. Eames became a prominent dentist in St. Louis and taught for many years at the Missouri Dental College. The Eames occupied "Selma" a noted mansion overlooking the Mississippi. One of their children, Col. William Eames, became a prominent architect.[15]

The move of the Scofield household to Atchison was completed shortly after the christening of Marie Helene.

CHAPTER 7 NOTES

1. E. N. Feltskog in his 1960 Edition of *The Oregon Trail* by Francis Parkman (University of Wisconsin Press) on page 490 (footnote to p. 76) notes a substantial decline in the fur trade after 1846. John Jacob Astor, in the face of the fashion-induced decline, had gotten out of the fur trade, turning it back to Scofield's in-laws and the other members of "The Clan." In the 20 years from the time of Parkman's adventure to the time Scofield arrived in St. Louis, the fur trade, while still profitable to the Clan, had further declined. Hence the interest of the in-laws in turning from fur trading to dealing in lands.
2. Timothy Papin, Sylvester's brother, five years younger, had studied medicine in Paris and returned to St. Louis to practice. The probability of continued connections with persons living along the Seine is most likely. Others no doubt kept up close contacts beyond invoicing and letters of credit.
3. St. Louis City Directory, 1865.
4. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 128.

5. "Grant Moves South," by Bruce Caton. Study of Grant and his campaigns in Virginia.
6. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 10–11.
7. From Records of the Court.
8. From St. Louis Directories of the period. Checked by Mrs. Arthur W. Felt, Researcher, Missouri Historical Society, letter to the writer, February 3, 1978.
9. Unpublished manuscript on the Cerré family. Copies in Missouri Historical Society and personal files of John H. Mize, Jr., Atchison, Kansas.
10. BeVier, *op. cit.*, Note 16. Also Washington Irving, *The Adventures of Captain Bonneville*, New York, 1937.
11. St. Louis *Daily Evening News*, 5 January 1860, as quoted in the Cerré manuscript.
12. Discharge Certificate.
13. Marriage Certificate
14. St. Louis City Directory 1868.
15. Information from the files of the Missouri Historical Society. See Chapters 3 and 5.

CHAPTER 8

In Kansas—Playground of the Secret Six

"We looked for peace, and there is no good; and for the time of healing and behold trouble!"

Jer. 14:19

To fully understand the environment in which Scofield practiced law and engaged in politics, the reader properly should read *The Secret Six* by Otto J. Scott.[1] This work, already referred to, shows how the very legitimate desire to end chattel slavery was misdirected by six wealthy men (who had given up Christian faith), misdirected into a bloody conflict which divided the nation and upset beyond repair relations between the races.

The story is relevant to the life of Scofield because "The Secret Six" selected Kansas (a territory in the 1850's) as the place to push their aims and try their ideas. The result: Kansas became known as "Bleeding Kansas".

The Secret Six, themselves remained safe in Boston, Mass. Henchmen and followers were used for the bloody deeds. The minions of The Secret Six remained dominant in Republican politics in Kansas until almost the end of the century. Cyrus Ingerson Scofield was personally intimate with those "minions" who had cut a swath of destruction and who continued to hold the ideals which originated in Boston. Otto Scott told the writer that he was doubtful whether anyone who had been in politics in Kansas in that period could ever have become a genuine Bible teacher.

As Kansas settled down after Appomattox, squatters moved in unoccupied lands. Squatters were a problem that almost all holders of extensive land-grants in the West had to contend with. Knowing How common the squatter problem was, Scofield, in relating his role in the Regis Loisel land case (the case involving the Papin family interests), described it in terms of squatters and their ejection from lands illegally occupied.[2] (That case is the only proceeding we positively know Scofield handled after his admission to the bar).

Typical was the story he told Luther Rees, sometimes pastor, securities salesman and Scofield's associate in the pastorate. Rees must have been a good listener. In his memorial piece at the time of Scofield's death, as related in *The Central American Bulletin*, the story he told

seems unlikely, even inaccurate.[3] As quoted from the Establishment poet John Greenleaf Whittier's "The Story of the Kansas Emigrants":

"They cross the prairies as of old
The Pilgrims crossed the Sea,
To make the West as they the East,
The Homestead of the free."[4]

Scofield is alleged to have replied with a rhyme which is probably the cleverest in all of his writing, but an evident parody of Whittier:

"They crossed the prairies in a band
To try to steal some railroad land!"

But before discussing the trial in terms of official data, the Scofield family must be relocated from St. Louis to Atchison, Kansas.

Sometime after mid-1869, Scofield reached Atchison. Here develops a problem in date-setting. (That problem will arise again and again both in this story and in the spread of Scofield's teaching.) As noted in Chapter 7, daughter Marie-Helene was born October 4, 1869, in St. Louis and baptized October 17.[5] Before the end of 1869, Scofield has spent some time in a Kansas law office (that of John J. Ingalls) to qualify for admission to the bar (but only that of the lower courts) in the State of Kansas.

The most likely explanation is that, since Leontine's pregnancy was well advanced by the time the decision to go to Atchison was made, she did not travel until after the baby was born. Thus Cyrus would have gone ahead, located a residence and started making legal and social connections. Leontine, Abigail and the new baby with the rest of the household followed late in October or in November.

Cyrus found a residence in Atchison on the south side of Kansas Avenue between 9th and 10th Streets.[6] The United States Census for 1870 in addition to the four Scofields, shows Henry Cerré, Leontine's brother, 19 years old, and Catharine McGuire, a white female, age 36, a native of Ireland; occupation, servant. Also in the household was Mary Brice, a negro female, age 10, born in Missouri; occupation, also servant.[7]

Now a household of this size could not operate and be maintained on the earnings of a tyro, fledgling lawyer. Either Leontine's dowry was remarkably income-producing, Scofield was drawing on anticipated land sale commissions, or else the Loisel-Papin interests were supporting the entire menage in anticipation of the land case settlement and the resulting sales.

Scofield had been empowered by the Loisel interests to engage the best legal counsel available. His selection, John J. Ingalls, was a reasonably successful transplanted New Englander, exactly the type that the Loisel interests would use without ever fully admitting him

to the innermost circles. Born December 29, 1833, in Middleton, Massachusetts, Ingalls was a graduate of Williams College, Class of 1855, and no doubt well permeated with Sadducean Leaven.[8] He came to Kansas in 1858, to serve The Secret Six and helped tip the balance in Kansas permanently in favor of Boston and all that meant.

Ingalls, true to his New England heritage, had been active in territorial politics. He became a state senator in 1861 after statehood. His advance in politics assures us that he was aware of the bloodshed in Kansas sponsored from Boston, and he must have accommodated to the morals which this implied. During The War Between The States, he was judge-advocate of the Kansas Militia. After the war, he edited the Atchison newspaper, *Freedom's Champion*, along with his law practice.

Scofield was most likely sponsored for admission to the bar by Ingalls. Since the Regis Loisel case (as the Papin family matter was referred to) was not to be heard immediately, Scofield entered into some sort of law partnership with Ingalls. Of course, as a qualified lawyer, his value to the family in the land case was enhanced.

As lawyers often do, Scofield went into politics. His position aligned with that of his partner Ingalls. In 1871, Scofield was elected as representative to the Lower House of the Kansas Legislature from the 4th District (Atchison).[9] The term of office at that time was one year. Commenting on Scofield's election, the *Atchison Patriot*, which had opposed him, said:

> Mr. Scofield is a gentleman of fine address and a scholar and we have no doubt he will reflect credit upon this city in the legislative halls.[10]

Scofield was assigned to the Committee on the Judiciary and became its chairman. The *Kansas Daily Commonwealth* (Topeka) commented on February 9, 1872:

> C. I. Scofield, the chairman, although a young man and inexperienced in the halls of legislation, has proved himself well qualified for the position.[11]

During 1872, the land case came up for hearing in the Second District Court, the court sitting in Nemaha County under Judge Hubbard. The genesis of the Loisel Lands case was a grant of land made March 25, 1800, by Don Carlos De Hault De Lassus, Spanish lieutenant government of Upper Louisiana to Regis Loisel, a "fur trader" and a resident of St. Louis (then in Spanish territory). Regis Loisel was the grandfather of Sylvester Papin, Emeline Scofield's late husband (he died in 1870).[12]

Loisel died October 2, 1804, leaving his property, including the rights to lands in the grant to his daughters, Clementine Loisel and Josephine Loisel. Beginning with the execution of the bequests in Loisel's

will, portions of the grant were sold, transferred to descendents, legitimate and illegitimate, executors and others. The intermarriages among individuals who became parties to the case are so involved that one is reminded of the folk song "I'm My Own Grandpaw!"

In 1858, Congress confirmed the Spanish grant to "Regis Loisel, or his legal representatives." That any bill, especially one of a private nature, relating to Kansas could get through Congress in 1958 suggests that the Clan had connections of the best order, far beyond what one might expect from fur traders, even ones with "French Connections." The Regis Loisel case was simply to determine, out of the welter of sales, transfers, marriages and bequeathals, who actually were the "legal representatives." Squatters, if involved at all, appear to be inconsequential to the main court action.

Since some of the land in the original scope of the Spanish grant had been occupied by persons who had secured valid titles, the surveyor general of the United States, on September 6, 1866, certified the location of 38,111.16 acres of land, equivalent to the original grants. The lands were located in Nemaha, Marshall, Jackson, Pottawatomie and Marion Counties, Kansas. Brown County, mentioned by BeVier does not appear in the settlement.[13]

The action, entitled *Munford vs. Papin* was not to evict squatters. The folks from St. Louis, including Cyrus and Leontine, were defendants, not plaintiffs. Nor were the plaintiffs squatters in any usually accepted sense of the term. Some of the Munfords had married into the Loisel Clan giving them status as claimants just as valid as that of Scofield. Additional land rights had been purchased from the estates of childless deceased members of the Clan. Morrison Munford himself was connected with the Kansas City (Mo.) *Times*.[14]

The decision, rendered May 24, 1872, was not a one-sided victory for the people represented by Scofield. Judge Hubbard ordered equal apportionment of the costs of the trial between plaintiffs and defendants.

With the decision given, thousands of acres of land in counties of Northern Kansas were made available for settlement and develoment. A booklet, relating the history of the case and describing the lands, noted that most of the tracts were available for sale from Morrison Munford in Kansas City, Missouri.[15] The remaining plots could be secured from either Scofield in Atchison or from Theophile Papin, one of Sylvester's surviving brothers, in St. Louis.[16]

At this time, Scofield in addition to serving in the Legislature, ran a law office which was also a "land-office." Whether he did a "land-office business" from his establishment is a bit difficult to determine without examination of the dates of original transfer of particular tracts, tract by tract.

In June 1872, Scofield's first son, Guy Sylvester, was born. Little Guy was destined to a short life, dying December 23, 1874.[17]

With the land case out of the way, Scofield went back to politics. The 1872 election campgaign was conducted by the Republicans with a fervor most unusual for a state which seemed so solidly Republican. Samuel C. Pomeroy, United States senator for the previous 12 years, was up for re-election. He would have to face the new Legislature which would convene in January 1873. (This was years before the 17th Amendment.) Quite remarkably, the Republican Campaign Committee made no endorsement of Pomeroy and "forgot" to mention him in the early days of the campaign. Being senior senator, Pomeroy was still a power. In many areas hostility to him was intense. His reputation was getting a bit "ripe" from his handling of land deals which seemed questionable. But even without official blessing, Pomeroy was active in the campaign which on election day produced a major Republican victory.[18]

Early in the campaign, Scofield's renomination to the Legislature in the 4th District had been blocked. Some sources blamed Pomeroy. But Ingalls felt that Scofield's presence in the Legislature was essential. So Scofield filed from Nemaha County using Seneca as his base.

There is a non-contemporary newspaper account which says that Scofield established residence in Seneca, such being in conformity with accepted American political mores.[19] Trumbull states that the move to Seneca was made because of the Regis Loisel case.[20] But Scofield's interest in the 8th District (Seneca) did not develop until after Judge Hubbard had decided the land case.

Here appears another discrepancy. When this writer checked Seneca in 1976, reference sources there reported no record of a residence for C. I. Scofield in the crucial period.[21] The Atchison City Directory for 1872-1873 lists Scofield in the same office and residence as does the previous edition.[22]

Obviously a man in Scofield's position did not keep his family in a sod hut on the prairie. The land office in Atchison was still active. Carpetbagging was then popular in other parts of the country under encouragement from the same sources which produced The Secret Six and their influence on Kansas. Whether or not Scofield established residence, he was accepted by the voters in the 8th District (Nemaha County) and elected in November 1872 as a Liberal Republican.

When the new Legislature convened on January 14, 1873, the most important business facing it was the election of a United States senator, either Pomeroy or his successor. Feeling was so intense that except for the formalities of organization, the two houses of the Legislature could not get down to serious business.[23] Pomeroy, looking out for himself, had come to Topeka and set up headquarters in the Tefft House hotel.

Pomeroy and anti-Pomeroy caucuses met nightly. The anti's were considering the names of then-Governor James M. Harvey, C. A. Lodge,

John M. Price and W. A. Phillips. Strenuous efforts were being made on behalf of each candidate to line up every member of the Legislature.

Realizing that his political life was at stake, Pomeroy, operating from his headquarters at the Tefft House, was making lavish expenditures for entertainment. He had engaged the main floors at all the principal hotels in Topeka. It was reported that he was buying votes like merchandise.

Scofield's activities at this point were not noted by the contemporary press.[24] (There is some difficulty reconciling press reports with what Trumbull reconstructed from his interview with Scofield 66 years later.) Indications are that Scofield was against Pomeroy but not openly committed to anyone getting overt attention from the anti-Pomeroy caucus. It is likely that some behind the scenes moves on behalf of Ingalls were already being made.

On the morning of January 28th, the two houses were required to cast separate votes for senator. The tally for the two houses was Pomeroy 50, Harvey 24, with 57 being needed to nominate. The houses adjourned hastily and the groups went back into caucus. The caucus of the anti's was enlivened by the story that Senator York of Montgomery County had gone over to Pomeroy.

According to Trumbull's story, on the afternoon of the 28th, Scofield was asked how he stood on Pomeroy's re-election.[25] "Against Pomeroy," Scofield replied. Then the anti's, according to Trumbull, asked Scofield for a suggestion of another name. Scofield reportedly said, "Ingalls," but sought assurance that Ingalls had a reasonable chance of defeating Pomeroy.

The now unidentified "anti" claimed to have evidence that Pomeroy would be defeated. He asked Scofield to try and commit Ingalls without specifics of his confidence in an Ingalls victory. Ingalls was that day still back in Atchison. A wire from Scofield impressed him with the urgent need for his presence in Topeka.

A special train on the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe brought Ingalls to the Capitol. When he arrived he conferred with Scofield. He acted as though he was not as confident of defeating Pomeroy as were those who were pushing his nomination. Confirmed politician that he was, Ingalls was willing to follow a trend. He did allow his name to be placed in nomination.

The caucus balloted all night. For the first 19 ballots, John M. Price (also of Atchison) was the leading candidates, lacking at one time only three votes for the nomination[26] After the 19th ballot, the support for C. A. Logan was given to Ingalls, sewing up the nomination. Scofield was asked to produce Ingalls. Ingalls came into the caucus room and made an impressive speech for "clean politics" in Kansas. The group remained in session all night, even having breakfast brought in to them early on the 29th.

After breakfast, the Pomeroy faction assembled in the House Chamber. The anti's came in shortly after, followed by the State Senate. The lieutenant-governor presided. Pomeroy was nominated to succeed himself as United States senator in a speech which recited his great service to the State of Kansas.

State Senator York arose and made a speech reciting his activities in Topeka in recent days, then to the utter amazement of all parties said: "Mr. President, I rise to second the nomination of S. C. Pomeroy, but" said Senator York, drawing out from his pocket a bundle, "not to a set in the United States Senate, but to a cell in the Kansas State Penitentiary at Leavenworth."[27] He called a page to his side and said: "Mr. President, I am sending you by the hand of this boy, seven thousand dollars in greenbacks that were handed to me last night by S. C. Pomeroy for my vote." In the light of later developments, much of the drama may have been for political effect rather than genuine moral concern.[28]

In the silence that followed York's act, Scofield arose and nominated John J. Ingalls to the post of United States senator from Kansas. Member after member rose to second the nomination.

The lieutenant-governor, tense with excitement, asked for other nominations. None were made. The vote was taken. Every vote was cast for John J. Ingalls. Many, besides York, with Pomeroy's money in their pockets dared not vote otherwise than for Ingalls. The lieutenant-governor announced: "Every ballot has been cast for John J. Ingalls. I hereby declare him duly elected senator from Kansas for the United States."

Scofield was asked to produce Ingalls. In five minutes he returned to the hall with the victor. "Dazed" by the unexpected turn of affairs, Ingalls made a brilliant speech of acceptance.

CHAPTER 8 NOTES

1. *The Secret Six* is one of the most outstanding works of revisionist history to come out to date. Otto Scott is now associated with R. J. Rushdoony in the Chalcedon "think-tank." Remarkably, no standard periodical, no matter how serious, no matter how conservative, has taken notice of Scott's work. It has been noticed only in the seemingly "underground" conservative press. Its findings are too devastating to standard historical beliefs.
2. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 10, Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 11.
3. *The Central American Bulletin*, Paris, TX, Sept. 15, 1981, p. 1.
4. "The Story of the Kansas Emigrants," *Whittier's Poems*, Boston, 1878.
5. See Chapter 7.
6. Atchison City Directory, 1870, p. 81.
7. Federal Census of Atchison, Vol. 3, Sec. 2, p. 35, July 2, 1870.
8. Basic data on Ingalls from "Who Was Who in America," checked with Otto J. Scott, *op. cit.*
9. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

10. *The Patriot*, Atchison, Kansas, November 9, 1871.
11. *Kansas Daily Commonwealth* (Topeka), February 9,, 1872.
12. Pamphlet: "Judgment and Decree of the District Court of Nemaha County, Kansas, Vesting the Title to the Loisel Lands in the various parties of Interest," Kansas City, No., Kansas City Times Steam Book and Job Printing House, 1872. Copy in the Library of the Kansas State Historical Society, Topeka.
13. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 12.
14. See footnote 12.
15. *Ibid.*
16. *Ibid.*
17. *The Choteau Family, A Genealogy of the Descendants and Collateral Branches*, completed by Beatric Clark Turner, privately printed, St. Louis 1906, p. 106.
18. The fate of Pomeroy is typical of those who serve conspirators like The Secret Six. It never pays to get caught. Once Pomeroy's shady deals became public, he was useless and dropped like a wornout shoe.
19. Pomeroy (Samuel Clark) was born January 3, 1816, in Southampton, Mass. He spent two years, 1836-1838, at Amherst College (Sadducean Leaven). He then located in Monroe County, New York, near Rochester, where according to Whitney Cross, he would have remained under the same cultural influences prevailing in Massachusetts. (Scott notes the importance of Rochester in the abolitionist movement.) In 1854, he was selected by The New England Emigrant Aid Society to lead a group of 200 to Kansas. He entered the territory on Sept. 8 at Kansas City. But the rough work of breaking the prairie and killing Southerners was not for Pomeroy. He settled in Atchison and is reported to have traveled extensively in the East to raise support for Kansas and the aims of The Secret Six. (Based on *Kansas and the Kansans*, vol. 3, p. 129, and U. S. Biographical Dictionary, p. 742.)
19. *Kansas City Journal*, August 3, 1921.
20. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 16.
21. Seneca (Kansas) Free Library, reply of November 10, 1976, to writer's request dated October 31, 1976.
22. Kansas State Historical Society.
23. Based on report in the Atchison Globe, from file of Kansas State Historical Society.
24. We concede the activity of Scofield, but as will note at other points in the story, others never considered Scofield's role in anything as important as it is made by Trumbull and other Dispensational devotees.
25. Trumbull reported the Pomeroy story in his Chapter II, pp. 13–14. BeVier covered it on his pagtes 13–15, largely basing his story on Trumbull.
26. The Kansas Volume of The United States Biographical Dictionary, Kansas City, S. Lewis and Company, 1879, sketch of John M. Price. Price was born in Richmond, Kentucky, on April 10, 1829. The family spent some time in Missouri, returning to Kentucky in 1845. Price was active in politics as early as 1851. He moved to Kansas in 1858. Despite his Southern border background, he immediately lined up with the Republican Party and thus with the minions of The Secret Six. The 1872-1873 campaign, when he tried first for the governorship, then for the Senate seat, was Price's last fling into politics. He subsequently devoted himself to business and secret societies. A biographical sketch of 1879 (*op. cit.*) notes that he was a Mason of advanced degree. Memberships were noted for 10 other secret societies. The item noted: "he (Price) . . . takes great interest in secret societies and associations, and as a result of this interest, and his proficiency in ritualism, he has always been honored with the highest offices these orders could bestow. As a member and officer of these various secret societies and associations, it is claimed that Mr. Price is in possession of about three hundred and seventy different pass-words, signs and tokens, more perhaps than any other man in the United States."

27. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 20.
28. This appears to have been the end of Pomeroy's active political role. The name Pomeroy is mentioned later in connection with social contacts of the Scofield family, especially the Atchison branch. Pomeroy died August 27, 1891, at Whitinsville, Mass., which is in Worcester County. Thus we note that he remained throughout his life in one cultural milieu.

CHAPTER 9

The Senator and the District Attorney

"For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil"
Rom. 13:3a

The new senator from Kansas, John J. Ingalls, took his seat in the 43rd Congress without challenge. He served three terms in the United States Senate. During his service, he introduced no important legislation. He was known as a witty, if not profound orator, and he was reported as being much given to "waving the bloody shirt" (Civil War heroics). He described John Brown's bloody acts at Ossawatomie and elsewhere as:

> The most brilliant and important episode of the Kansas War. It was the high divide of the contest. It was our Thermopylae. John Brown was our Leonidas with his Spartan band.[1]

Such a version of Brown, with blithe justification of ruthless murder shows that Ingalls remained empty of morality, the same disregard for the truth which marked the ideals of The Secret Six. This man was Scofield's mentor and partner.

During Ingall's last term in the Senate, in 1886, President Cleveland appointed Zechariah Montgomery of California to the post of assistant attorney general of the United States. Montgomery was a strenuous and able opponent of statist education. He had just completed a study of schools in which the significant point was "that the cost of public school work in the State of New York increased in inverse ratio to the number of pupils taught, while as we have seem, crime increases in direct proportion to the cost."[2] Such a "heretical" statement aroused the ire of Ingalls. True to his New England heritage, he tried to block Montgomery's appointment. The move failed utterly, and Montgomery served throughout Cleveland's first term. Montgomery's study went unheeded for years. It is again commanding attention as its conclusions are even more valid 100 years later than when first published. After being out of print for years, Montgomery's work is again available and is receiving the attention of concerned parents.[3]

Ingalls was defeated in the Populist upheaval of 1890 (Raise more hell and less corn!) and retired to Las Vegas, New Mexico, where he died in 1901.

Senator Ingalls had not forgotten his client-partner-supporter. Almost as soon as he arrived in Washington, Ingalls submitted a rec-

ommendation to President Grant, bearing his name and the names of four other Kansans. The petition read:

> We have the honor to respectfully recommend the appointment of Cyrus I. Scofield to the office of United States District Attorney for the District of Kansas.[4]

President Grant made the appointment and, in due course, Scofield gave up his seat in the Legislature and prepared to take the office of United States district attorney, replacing Albert H. Horner. At the time of his appointment, Scofield was 29, the youngest district attorney in the country.

Scofield took the oath of office on June 8, 1873. The ex-Confederate soldier solemnly swore that he had:

> . . . never voluntarily borne arms against the United States since I have been a citizen thereof, that I have voluntarily given no aid, countenance, counsel or encouragement to persons engaged in armed hositility thereto . . . that I have not yielded a voluntary support to any pretended government authority, power of constitution, within the United States, hostile or inimical thereto. . . .[5]

Now that oath, as Scofield took it, was rank perjury. We know that Scofield had supported an authority hostile to the United States. His claims of military service to the end of the war, circulated in the Dispensational community, if true, would only intensify the perjury of that oath. Evidently Scofield in 1873 was not concerned about perjury.

With apparent unconcern about either the validity of his oath or his personal morals, Scofield went immediately to work in his new post. Since the West was still a bit wild, Scofield had to concern himself about the affairs of the Indians, especially in the Oklahoma Territory (then officially called Indian Territory) just south of Kansas. Two days after taking office, he made recommendations to Attorney General Williams in Washington.[6]

Reports were on hand which indicated, quite typically, that whiskey was being sold to the Indians by the whites. It was noted that the: "U.S. Commissioners, Deputy Marshals, etc. are in corrupt collusions with the violators of the laws."[7]

Scofield noted that his options were limited by the matter of jurisdiction. His authority ended at the Kansas line, as did that of the federal agents in Indian Territory. Thus, a white man could sell whiskey in the territory, and if not apprehended, cross back to safety in Kansas. The Indians could and did cross into Kansas, commit crimes, even murder, and return to safety from prosecution in Indian Territory. Scofield stated that keeping whiskey from the Indians would alleviate much of the trouble.[8]

In his recommendations, he asked for *per diem* and mileage allowances to make a trip to the border to confer with his deputy marshalls

and with the Indian agents. He noted that his chief marshall, Marshall Tough, was doing all in his power to handle the problem.

On July 17, 1873, the *Kansas Daily Commonwealth* of Topeka carried an editorial "Justice in the South-West."[9] It noted that Scofield and Marshall Tough were undertaking to enforce the law, especially on the border of Indian Territory. The article noted that there was corruption in the courts in the southern part of the state. "The law prohibiting the sale of liquor to the Indians for instance is in some sections violated with shameless openness." The editor commended Scofield and Tough because they had "very sensibly chosen it for their first scene of duty".

Accompanied by an escort of cavalry, Scofield went after some men who were taking whiskey into Indian Territory for sale to the Indians. The men were desperate, and Scofield risked being shot. He was successful in rounding up some of the worst liquor traders and brought them back to Leavenworth.

When the "rumrunners" came to trial, most of the district attorney's witnesses were Indians who could not speak a word of English. A half-breed was secured who served as interpreter. The defense tried to break down the testimony of the Indians, but the Indians with a reference for the Great Spirit, recognized the nature of an oath and had a respect for honesty. The liquor men were found guilty and convicted.

Trumbull reports an incident after the trial:

> When, later in the day, Scofield went to the lodgings where he had his Indian witnesses entertained, he found the leading one, a stately chief named "Powder Face", squatting on a bed. As the District Attorney entered the room, the Indian quickly raised his left hand high over his head, with his right hand patted his heart, and smiled—and a smile is a very rare thing to see on the face of an Indian. What it meant was, "I love you". And the interpreter explained to Scofield, "Powder Face would die for you now, after making that sign. It is a pledge of eternal friendship."[10]

The district attorney's office did not run smoothly. In August, Scofield requested the appointment of a new assistant district attorney for Kansas. The incumbent was violating an executive order of the president by occupying the office of assistant United States attorney while also holding the post of attorney general of the State of Kansas. Sadducean leaven must have been running out of loaves. Scofield recommended that one Thomas Ryan be his new assistant.[11]

In addition to the prosecution of the liquor dealers, during the October term of the Court, Scofield conducted a vigorous prosecution of a case against Colonel Modoc Jennison, who was accused of defrauding the United States. *The Kansas Daily Commonwealth* quoted from three other Topeka papers.[12] Typical was the comment of the *Evening Call* which said that they: ". . . do not hesitate to assure the people of Kansas

that they will never have just cause to complain of his appointment.[13] A month later, the *Commonwealth* (which seemed almost to be Scofield's own paper) said:

> Our readers will recollect how a majority of the papers in the state attacked him so maliciously, at the time of his appointment last spring. Many expressed opinion at the time that he would disgrace the office, but were happily disppointed.[13]

Sic transit gloria. At the time Scofield's term of office had only a few more weeks to run. The termination and the speculation as to the cause, made a mockery of the plaudits of the newspapers.

Trumbull, discussing this period (at the opening of his Chapter III) states that Scofield during his term as district attorney, made frequent trips to Washington.[14] It does appear that he was on the go during his term of office. Leontine, the girls and little Guy were left in Atchison. The time Scofield could have spent with his family must have been minimal. Little Guy was by that time ailing. The burden, physical and emotional, of the sick child would have fallen squarely on Leontine.

But Trumbull's statement of frequent trips to Washington is, at best, highly questionable. A check was made of the issues of *The Official Guide of the Railways* for the summer of 1873.[15] From these volumes, it is apparent that a trip from Topeka to Washington would have taken at least three days going and three days on the return. This assumes that the trains ran on time and all of the many connections were made with no delays. In 1873, this was not at all likely.

It is unreasonable to assume that anyone who had taken three or four days on the train to Washington would immediately turn around and head back to Kansas. Any business which would justify a trip would, normally in Washington atmosphere, take several days to progress. (Then as now, in Washington, matters are *never* concluded.) In a Washington summer in the days before air-conditioning, things must have moved more slowly than molasses flowing uphill in a Kansas January.

In the light of Scofield's recorded activity in Kansas, the time consumed in travel and his short term of office, the reference to "frequent trips" must be added to the list of Scofield improbabilities.

That he did get to Washington at least once after Appomattox is hinted at by the references to President Grant and to the dinner addressed by Senator Roscoe Conkling (R-N.Y.). The recorded events in Kansas would suggest that the trip occurred late in June or early in July 1873. Ingalls invited to the dinner was happily able to include his protege who by chance was in Washington.

Note that in December 1873, there are newspaper reports which implied that Scofield was outside the State of Kansas.[16] He might have

been in Washington again, but by December 1873, the denouement was approaching.

CHAPTER 9 NOTES

1. John J. Ingalls, "John Brown's Place in History" *North American Review*, February 1884. Written after conferring with Charles Sanborn an associate of The Secret Six and others in order to defend Brown against charges which had been made by one Rev. David N. Utter in the November 1883 issue of that periodical. Ingall's article failed as a defense of Brown, but the mass of historical writing and especially history as taught in public schools and state universities has, up to now, protected the Brown legend.
2. Zach Montgomery, *The School Question*, p. 25, Gilson, Washington, 1886.
3. Reprinted in the 1970's by St. Thomas Press, Houston, Texas.
4. United States Department of Justice, National Archives, Record Group 60, March 11, 1873.
5. Record Group 60, June 9, 1873.
6. Record Group 60, June 11, 1973.
7. Record Group 60, June 11, 1873.
8. *Kansas Daily Commonwealth*, Topeka, July 17, 1873.
9. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, pp. 23, 24.
10. Department of Justice, Record Group 60, Aug. 20, 1873.
11. Issue of October 17, 1873.
12. As picked up, *op. cit.*, October 17, 1873.
13. *Commonwealth*, November 22, 1873.
14. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 25.
15. Official Railway Guides in the collection of Chicago area railfan, Arthur D. Dubin.
16. *Kansas Daily Commonweath*, December 17, 1873.

CHAPTER 10

The District Attorney Resigns

"He that troubleth his own house shall inherit the wind."
Prov. 11:29

Scofield's term as United States district attorney for Kansas came to a sudden end in just over six months.[1] On December 14, 1873, the *Daily Times* of Leavenworth carried a story which suggested that something was amiss in the U. S. District Attorney's Office. A case against ex-Senator Pomeroy was pending. Reports circulated that Thomas Ryan, the assistant district attorney, was to prosecute the case instead of Scofield. There were hints that both men were somehow implicated. The article stated that an affidavit existed in which Pomeroy claimed to have paid Scofield a sum of money to keep him (Pomeroy) from being brought to trail. The *Times* editor concluded:

> At first we were inclined to regard the appointment of Mr. Scofield with disfavor, but subsequently we have had high hopes for him, which were justified by his gentlemanly bearing and display of legal skill. We sincerely trust that an inquiry into the charges preferred by Mr. Pomeroy's affidavit will result in thorough vindication of his character.[2]

The other papers in Leavenworth, the Kansas City *Times*, the Lawrence *Tribune*, came to Scofield's defense and discredited what they alleged to be rumors.[3] The *Commonwealth* (Leavenworth) did indicate that Scofield was absent from the state, but advocated a complete investigation of the charges on his return.[4]

Another item on the affair, with more detail, appeared in the *Times* on December 21, 1873. Scofield, Pomeroy and even Ingalls were involved. The incident was termed "the most infamous of all infamous political bargains ever transacted in Kansas. . . ." The report suggested that blackmail had been paid to Ingalls and Scofield by railroads and settlers in Southern Kansas. (If that report could be substantiated, Scofield's description of the "Loisel case" to the Dispensational constituency, through Luther Rees, was unprincipled.)

The *Times*, in its December article referred to previously, claimed that the Pomeroy party would "save" Scofield and that Ingalls was demanding that Scofield resign. In the light of the 1899 story,[5] Ingalls' fury would be understandable. Pomeroy would not have minded seeing Ingalls discomfitted. The *Times* commented: "It would be strange enough to see Pomeroy cherishing the discarded pet of Ingalls."[6] The *Times* further predicted that Scofield would not resign and that Pomeroy's

case would never be brought to court because Scofield and Pomeroy had struck a bargain.

Unfortunately for the *Times* role in prognostication, on December 20, 1873, Scofield had written President Grant:

> I hereby resign the position of United States Attorney for the District of Kansas.
>
> Respectfully
> Cyrus I. Scofield[7]

Remarkably as late as January 4, 1874, the Leavenworth *Times* was reporting the resignation talk as rumors of little value. Apparently Scofield had returned to the city by this time and continued to fill the office until George W. Peck, his successor, was installed.

In the light of reports connected with the resignation of Scofield, the righteousness displayed by the anti-Pomeroy faction a few months earlier seems to have been more for political effect than with any real moral basis. Note again that the Ingalls and the Pomeroys remained on good personal terms with the Scofield families during the rest of their respective lives.

At this point, we enter into a second period of mystery, unbroken until 1877, not really cleared up until the end of 1879 or early 1880. Note, however, that Scofield was never again involved in politics. In considering the end of Scofield's political life we note the comment of one historican:

> Throughout the period unscrupulous national and state legislatures were openly bought and sold by the highest bidders and during Ulysses S. Grant's Administration (1869-1877) part of the Executive Branch of the National Government was viciously corrupt.[8]

A more specific note is provided by Robert L. Pierce who notes that the national scene was governed by "a Grant Administration which many students believe was heavily influenced by the contemporary Insiders of the Master Conspiracy."[9]

Boston in that day was still a major source of capital. Boston financiers exercised major control of American business; the railroads were one major area. They encouraged the corruption of the period for their own gain.

Ernest Gordon, writing from a Christian viewpoint, is the only writer who has so far shown how these Proper Bostonians were permeated with and motivated by the values produced by Sadducean leaven. Gordon notes of the Unitarian advance around Boston:

> Many churches went over *en masse*, taking buildings and endowments with them. This was the case with twelve of the fourteen churches in Boston.[10]

Thus as the Victorian Era advanced, Proper Bostonians still went to the meeting house, but to one whose message was Unitarian. As one Bostonian, Francis J. Child, who was later enlightened noted:

> I ought to say that Unitarianism which ruined papa's happiness and peace and likely his eternal joy and spoiled all my childhood, and youth, and young manhood, I have observed to the always deteriorating and disintegrating in its influence and effect, spiritually and morally. I know many instances, especially in the leading families of Boston.[11]

The Secret Six were not unique.

Under moral influences such as noted by Child, the Boston financiers came to their desks on State Street six days a week to issue orders in the economic area which abetted that sort of corruption which marred Ingalls, Pomeroy and Scofield. Those Proper Bostonians had the drive of the Puritan work-ethic, but without the Biblical morality which keeps that drive within decent bounds.

Theologian R. L. Dabney commenting on the period said:

> There never was so much prosperous wickedness as in this day. Society calling itself decent, and even religious, never was so venal and cowardly in doing homage to prosperous wickedness. But I never felt so certain in my life that it was all a disgusting vain show; and that all of it is bound to come to utter grief; while those that fear God and keep His commandments will come out all right.[12]

Note Dabney's reference to "keep His commandments", a directive generally overlooked at the time. It is also overlooked today, thanks in part to the efforts of the "new" Scofield, of whom more anon. A wry note is offered by the fact that, when in the Progressive Era an unsuccessful effort was made to deal with these problems, the effort was made by people just as full of Sadducean leaven as those who had aggravated the problems in the days we are considering.

But back to Scofield. At this point, we have the phenomenon of a man in his early thirties, responsible for the support of a family of four, disappearing as a matter of record for three—even five-years.

Trumbull glosses over the separation period, merely stating that Scofield did not like the type of life and the associates and activities related to the office of district attorney.[13] Since Scofield did keep in touch with the families of his associates to the end of his life, we must question at least part of Trumbull's statement. If we assume that Trumbull, like most Fundamentalists, was unaware that Scofield was married at this point in time, his evaluation is a bit fatuous.

The relatives accepted an actual separation between Cyrus and Leontine. Emeline Scofield Papin had her will drawn in 1877, signing the document on November 7th. She bequeathed equal shares of her estate to Cyrus, Laura and Victorine. But she took legal notice of the Scofield separation by a provision that if Cyrus and Leontine were not

living together, the share for Cyrus was to be divided between husband and wife.[14] Emeline was well aware of the broken Scofield household.

One glimmer of knowledge in this period. The *St. Louis City Directory* for 1877 has an entry:

> Scofield, Cyrus I., Lawyer
> 206 North 8th Street
> Residence, 3029 Dickson.[15]

This entry means that Cyrus had written Kansas off, along with Leontine. It should confirm Trumbull's statement that Scofield returned to St. Louis to practice law, except for the following.

In ordinary usage, the practice of law means the ability to provide all legal services, including appearances in a client's behalf before courts of competent jurisdiction. Such service could not be offered by Scofield, himself. In view of his return to St. Louis with a besmirched name, it seems unlikely that any ethical, competent member of the bar would associate himself with the Scofield office.

Admission to the Bar of St. Louis and the State of Missouri, not obtained before he left for Kansas in 1869, was out of the question. Scofield's behavior between 1877 and 1879 made it impossible. It was never granted. "The Bench and Bar of St. Louis County", an official publication of the legal profession was checked.[16] It shows that at no time in the 19th century was C. I. Scofield a member of the St. Louis Bar.

A member of the bar in one state can usually be admitted to that of another state when he relocates. But the Scofield who resigned an office of public trust in 1873 with a cloud on his name would have been rash indeed to call on his former associates in Kansas for the appropriate recommendations. The Choteau Clan would hardly have been much help. The reputation of the dashing young Tennessean from Michigan was tarnished in 1877.

CHAPTER 10 NOTES

1. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 25, specifically refers to "Two years of service as United States District Attorney". The source of his information had to be Scofield himself, who knew very well that his service lasted from his taking the perjured oath on June 8, 1873, to the letter of resignation, dated December 20, 1873, and the replacement by George W. Peck in January 1874.
2. *Daily Times*, Leavenworth, Kansas, December 14, 1873.
3. The papers all carried the story after its original appearance in Leavenworth on the 14th. The *Commonwealth*'s item appeared December 17, 1873.
4. *Ibid.*, December 17, 1873.
5. The story, referred to in Chapter 9, appeared in *Kansas Topics, The Kansas City* (Mo.) *Journal*, December 28, 1899.
6. *Daily Times*, Leavenworth, Kansas, December 21, 1873.
7. U. S. Department of Justice, National Archives, Record Group 60, December 20, 1873.

8. Richard D. Heffner, *A Documentary History of the United States*, The New American Library of World Literature, Inc., 1959, p. 158–160.
9. Robert L. Pierce, *The Rapture Cult*, Signal Mountain, Tenn., 1978, p. 50.
10. E. E. Gordon, *The Leaven of the Sadducees*, BICA, 1927, p. 42. The term "Proper Bostonians" was coined by Cleveland Amory in his work of that title.
11. Gordon, *op. cit.*, p. 47.
12. *The Life and Letters of Robert Lewis Dabney*, by Thomas Cary Johnson, section entitled *Thoughts When Sixty Four* as published in *The Banner of Truth*, Issue 168, September 1977, Edinburgh, Scotland and Carlisle, Pennsylvania.
13. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 35, 36.
14. From papers of the Emeline Scofield Papin Estate on file in the St. Louis County Courthouse, Clayton, Mo. The document will be further discussed in Chapter 18.
15. St. Louis City Directory, 1877.
16. As checked for the writer by the St. Louis Public Library, History and Genealogy Department.

CHAPTER 11

Missing His Day in Court

"And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous."

I John 2:1b

When C. I. Scofield gave information to the publishers of "Who's Who in America" he mentioned being admitted to the bar in Kansas, but made no mention of the bar in Missouri.[1] That entry omits a reference to something important to the story of Scofield's life circulated in the Evangelical community. But as we suggested in the last chapter, the admission of Cyrus Scofield to the bar in Missouri at any time was highly improbable, and more pertinent, is not confirmed by some recognized reference sources.[2]

Trumbull's story of a successful law practice becomes very unlikely as we consider the references to the activity of Cyrus Scofield between 1877 and 1879.[3] In that period, we find entries relating to Scofield in the Court Records of St. Louis which show that Cyrus, rather than practicing law, was highly in need of counsel for his defense.

In August and September 1877, the Circuit Court of St. Louis had on its docket, Case 0 44252, *Jephtha H. Simpson vs. Cyrus I. Scofield, Emeline E. Papin and C. F. Betts.*[4] C. P. Ellerbe was attorney for the plaintiff. The case grew out of an act of Scofield on June 6, 1877. On that day, he signed a 60-day note for $200 with interest at 10 percent per annum. The note bore signatures alleging endorsement by Emeline E. Papin and C. F. Betts. The record of the case indicates that the note was handled by the Boatmen's Bank, still a leading St. Louis financial institution.

After the 60 days, Ellerbe, on Simpson's behalf, attempted to present the note for payment. The petition to the court affirmed that Ellerbe was unable to locate either Scofield's residence or place of business. Apparently at some time between the closing date for the 1877 *City Directory* and August, the "law" office at 206 North 8th Street had been closed. Without an office, the "successful law practice" alleged by Trumbull (based on Scofield's relation) becomes more and more improbable. Simpson's petition further declares that both Emeline and Betts declined to pay the note.

With the petition, bearing the date of September 4, 1877, is a note of service signed by James Carroll, deputy of the sheriff of the City of St. Louis, stating that the petition was served on Betts, and a further

note, "The other defendants could not be found in the City of St. Louis." Emeline lived in Webster (now Webster Groves), Missouri, in the same county, and the petition was served on her by a deputy of the County Sheriff's Office.

In her answer, Emeline:

> . . . denies and says it is not true that the note sued on and filed in this case was ever delivered to her—and further says that she never assigned said note filed in this suit by endorsement in writing or otherwise, nor did she ever deliver or consent to the delivery of same to the plaintiff or any other person whatsoever. She further says that she never wrote or endorsed her name on the note sued on . . .

She requested that she be dismissed from the suit.

Reports that Scofield engaged in forgery in this period were not silenced by his entry into the ministry. Emeline's denial is no doubt correct. The signature in her name seems quite probably to have been forged by her brother.

The case came up for hearing March 1, 1878. In preparation for the hearing, Emeline's attorney had subpoenaed Charles L. Bass, a teller at Boatmen's Bank, to testify in her behalf. As an outcome of the March 1 hearing, Simpson withdrew the action against Scofield and Papin, leaving Betts as defendant with $219.30 owed as of date, with 10% interest still accruing. Copies of the note and protest were withdrawn from the case on December 8, 1879. The record gives no indication that Simpson ever got his money. A reporter was to assert a few years later that Emeline was helping Cyrus out of some of his scrapes.[5]

Scofield must have been very much in need of funds. On May 28, 1877, he made a 90-day promissory note for $900.00 to the order of Emeline E. Papin. The note with apparent endorsement by Emeline was delivered to James H. McLean, who became the plaintiff in Case 46333.[6] McLean was a doctor with an office at 316 Chestnut Street, just eight doors away from the office of Charles F. Betts. Again, this note appears to have been negotiated through the Boatmen's Bank. McLean's case for non-payment appears on the docket of the April term of court in 1878.

On June 4, 1878, Emeline filed her answer. In this case, also, she denied endorsing the note and disclaimed ability to testify regarding the facts about the note alleged by plaintiff. In the legal sense, we must consider her answer true. The endorsement which read "Emeline E. Papin" was a forgery, very likely made by Cyrus. We suspect that Emeline was aware of what Cyrus did.

The case did not come to trial immediately—due to postponements. The surviving papers indicate that Deputy Sheriff John Finn was unable to locate Scofield in St. Louis on October 7, 1878. Scofield's whereabouts

cannot be determined. The case was continued on December 18, 1878, and also on March 10, 1879.

In anticipation of a hearing May 6, 1879, subpoenaes were issued against Dr. William Eames, Timothy Papin, Sam Semple (who lived at the same address as Timothy Papin on 6th Street) and Ben L. Chase of Boatmen's Bank. The papers bear the notation following the May 6 hearing, "Dismissed on motion of the plaintiff," But that notation gives no clue as to whether McLean ever got his $900 or whether Scofield made any effort at restitution.

The transcript of the trial in the next case strengthens our belief that Scofield was quite active in mid-1877. The activity—forgery. Charles F. Betts, under cross-examination by Samuel Reber, Emeline's attorney, said, answering a question from counsel about Scofield: "He told me that he was raising money for a Mr. Watkins or some gentleman on Main Street.

Reber: "He was raising money through you?"

Betts: "And some others, Yes, sir."

Reber: "And he was raising money in Mrs. Papin's name?"

Betts: "Yes, sir, on her name."[7]

The accumulated documents suggest that the phrase "On Mrs. Papin's name" was a euphemism for forgery. The case at hand gives a hint that Scofield was quite expert. He used different methods as suited the situations and the obstacles to be overcome.

The testimony of Mr. Betts was given in Case 44326, *Frank Vollmer vs. Emeline E. Papin et al*; heard on May 10, 1878, before Hon. James J. Lindley, Judge.[8] The cause of the action was a promissory note for $250 dated June 28, 1877 (a Thursday), bearing a signature which read "Emeline E. Papin." The endorsements were by Cyrus I. Scofield and Charles F. Betts. In the light of the testimony recorded in the case, it appears that Scofield actually made the note, writing both the signature reading "Emeline E. Papin" and his own endorsement.

Betts was identified as a real estate broker with an office at 308 Chestnut Street, St. Louis. On the stand, he admitted to being a "note broker." The suggestion is that Betts operated on the fringes of the business community, dealing in the leavings that the regular financial sources would not touch.

After the note was made, either Thursday the 28th or Friday the 29th, Scofield and Betts took the note to the St. Louis National Bank and several other banks as well. None of them would touch the note. By noon on Monday, the 2nd of July, Scofield and Betts had worked out a scheme for selling the note. It required Emeline's cooperation.

Betts owed a bill of $48 to a tailor, Frank Vollmer, whose shop was in the building of the St. Nicholas Hotel. Scofield prepared what

purported to be a "Letter of Introduction" to Emeline. The two men appeared in Vollmer's shop about 1 o'clock on Monday. Vollmer's first reaction appears to have been skeptical. Responding to Vollmer's expressions of doubt about the note, Scofield said: "Do you expect that I want to go to the Penitentiary for $250?"[9] Vollmer's reply was that he was concerned about the soundness of the note as he did not want to lose his money. Since both Scofield and Mrs. Papin were unknown to Vollmer, Scofield suggested that Vollmer go out to Emeline's home in Scofield's rented horse and buggy and get Emeline's assurance on the validity of the note.[10]

Armed with the "Letter of Introduction" Betts and Vollmer (Betts most likely at the reins) drove the 12 miles out to the Papin residence on Big Bend Road in Webster Groves. Emeline received the two men as per instruction in Scofield's "Letter of Introduction," excused herself, went into another room to read it. It appears from the testimony given in court that Scofield did *not* present Vollmer as a prospective purchaser of the note. (The testimony has inconsistencies between the statements of the various witnesses, not at all unusual in such a situation.)

On the stand, Emeline referred to the visit as follows:

> Well, then Mr. Betts asked me repeatedly "Will you say whether this note is good" and I said I will not say whether it is good not, I said my brother informs me in this note that he will be out here on the 6 o'clock train, I remember saying that, but what I said in connection with that I don't remember positively. I was very much agitated at the time, I thought it was a transaction that had already taken place, something that had transpired in which my brother was placed in danger and that Mr. Vollmer was brought out there as a witness or a spy or I didn't know what.[11]

Vollmer noted that Emeline said she did not have money available as of that day (July 2) to discount the note. It is evident that at no time did she either affirm or deny the validity of the signature (her name) on the note.

The two men left and drove back to St. Louis. They stopped at the Commercial Bank, and talked to a Mr. Nicholls, who did not know Mrs. Papin. Since it was now late in the day, the matter was held over.

On the 3rd, Scofield and Betts returned to Vollmer's shop. Vollmer gave Betts a check for $250 which was cashed at the Commercial Bank. Betts' bill at Vollmer's was considered paid. In turn, Betts gave Scofield $100, holding the balance which Scofield owed him.

Betts was out of the city for several weeks. On his return, he again went out to Webster Groves. This time he was with a man identified only as "Mr. Anderson." A note was the reason for this visit. In court, Betts stated that during this visit, Emeline admitted that she knew the Vollmer note was a forgery.[12]

At the end of 60 days, Vollmer tried to discount the note. On August 14, 1877, A. K. Taylor, on Vollmer's behalf, filed suit against Papin, Scofield and Betts, the matter being assigned No. 44326 on the Docket. City Deputy Carroll was able to serve a summons only on Betts. A county deputy no doubt made service on Emeline. No record of service on Scofield was in the file, nor did anyone make any answer on his behalf. His name was ultimately dropped from the proceeding.

Emeline answered on September 28, 1877, with a denial of Vollmer's allegation that she had made the note. The case was originally set for hearing January 30, 1878, but postponed. In anticipation of a hearing on May 6, subpoenaes were served on Betts, Charles L. Bush, a teller at Boatmen's Bank and on Dr. James McLean, the victim in Case 46333. Neither Bush nor McLean gave any testimony of record.

From Emeline's testimony on May 10, 1878, we reproduce the following:

> Well, Mr. Betts came out there with Mr. Vollmer, I do not remember whether he introduced Mr. Vollmer to me as he says or not, but he handed me a letter, I opened it and asked to be excused as the letter directed me to do on the envelope, I retired and read the letter, it agitated me very much, so much so that I could scarcely stand, I was so completely surprised and agitated by the letter that I went back into the room and repeated something that was in the letter but I really can't say what it was, I understood from the letter that there was a note that was due and that my brother was in great danger and therefore I said . . . (Testimony at this point was interrupted by plaintiff's attorney)[13]

Emeline's statement suggests that she was more deeply involved in Scofield's nefarious capers than anyone had previously imagined. It is hard to know whether she considered the use of her name was merely being helpful to "Little Bub" or whether she was an active and willing collaborator.

As the cross-examination of Emeline concluded, the plaintiff's counsel asked her if she knew where Scofield was. Her reply was that she had last seen him about three weeks before in Carondelet.[14] Asked if he was at the house on Big Bend Road, she replied that she had not been home since Sunday (the 5th) and could not tell (the court date being Friday, the 10th).

The glimpses of Cyrus in 1877 and 1878 as gathered from court records belie the story by Trumbull and others that Scofield was a successful lawyer, serving a respectable clientele.

Judge Lindley instructed the jury to find for the defendant as it had not been proven that Emeline had actually made the note. The jury ignored Judge Lindley and found for Vollmer with damages in the amount of $384.41. A transcript read a century later does not tell us everything. It does not show mannerisms, inflections, expressions which

might have impressed the jury more than the attorney's pleadings based on statute.

Utilizing a bit of folk knowledge, the jury knew that Vollmer had been defrauded and was entitled to redress. And even if Emeline had not made the note, the jury may have felt that she was morally guilty, even if that guilt had not been established by evidence within terms of the statute.

On June 28, 1879, Emeline, continuing to utilize the services of attorney Samuel Reber, appealed the decision, posting a bond of $800 with her appeal. The appeal was not heard until the October term of the Appeals Court in 1879. The Appeals Court decision of November 4, 1879, went strictly according to the letter of the law and found for Emeline. So Vollmer did not get his money back through the legal processes. We have no firm indication that Cyrus I. Scofield ever felt an obligation to make things right with Frank Vollmer.

Now, according to that which is official in Dispensational circles, Cyrus was, by the time the Appeals Court rendered its decision, within the Kingdom and starting on the road to righteousness. Note in this connection that Trumbull suggested that a good foundation of Christian teaching was implanted in the children in the Scofield homestead, whether in Saratoga County, N. Y. or in Lenawee County, Michigan.[15] The antics of brother and sister in 1877-1879 suggests that if such teaching had been implanted, during those two years it was being ignored.

It has been suggested that reference to Scofield's early exploits overlooks the power of Jesus Christ to save a man.[16] A possible valid point, but the reader, before consigning the matters related in this chapter to limbo, is asked to carefully weigh the story of Scofield's conversion as related in the next chapter.

The *Republican*, a St. Louis newspaper, in its issue of November 7, 1879, the Friday after the Appeals Court decision in the Vollmer case carried an item which adds confusion to the matter of Scofield's legal scrapes. It reads:

> A case of forgery against Cyrus I. Scofield was disposed of in the criminal court yesterday. Mr. Scofield was arrested about a year ago and his case has been continued from time to time, and never come to trial. Yesterday it was admitted by the prosecution that a case could not be made, and as there was no proof to substantiate the charge against Mr. Scofield, who is a gentleman well known as having occupied positions of trust, a *nolle prosequi* was entered by order of Judge Laughlin. The defendant had employed Mr. Martin to defend him, and was determined in case the matter reached a trial to fight it vigorously. He had little fear of a confiction, but the happy termination of the case yesterday was a relief to him.[17]

The report presents a problem. If it was reporting the Vollmer case, it was in no way accurate. The inaccuracy of the report does not

make up for the fact that Mr. Vollmer evidently had a very incompetent, disinterested or incapable lawyer. If the report refers to another case, we must continue to question whether the assertion of lack of proof is correct. The charges against Scofield followed a familiar and well-authenticated pattern. The timing of the dismissal of the case, the conclusion of the other cases of record, suggest that Scofield was the beneficiary of what today is referred to as "clout."

At about this time, the local "Fundamentalist" community was deeply involved in final arrangements for an evangelistic campaign conducted by D. L. Moody. Scofield, a new convert, was to work in the campaign. Hence, clout was brought into play in Cyrus' cases, to clear him for his role in Christian work.

In the course of research for this work, the author has run across persistent rumors that at sometime in the 1870's, Scofield served one or more prison sentences in Canada, Now, in the period currently under consideration, there are unaccounted for intervals when such prison terms might have been served. However, prison authorities in the Dominion of Canada, including those of the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec, have no record of any term for a prisoner named Cyrus Scofield in the 1870's.[18]

BeVier, in his thesis, had just "discovered" Leontine and the girls. He assumed that they moved to St. Louis at sometime after the district attorney's post was vacated. He assumed that among the several changes in Cyrus' life in 1879, one was Leontine's decision to leave him and return to Atchison with the girls. Recent conversations with Atchison residents assures us that BeVier's assumption is unwarranted. Leontine never left Atchison.

Scofield's role as husband and father had been irregular ever since he had entered politics. Without regular employment and steady income, Cyrus did wander. We had tried in our minds to justify this as ostensible searching for new employment or for a new spot to hang out his shingle. Reports of the period do not permit such an allowance.

The fact that Scofield's life through this period was related to and by Trumbull as though he were a bachelor suggests that he considered his roles as husband and father unimportant. Even the supposedly submissive role of a Victorian wife would find this intolerable. Leontine had even endured the loss of one of her children. We cannot be sure that Cyrus was at her side to comfort her when the little white coffin bearing the remains of Guy was lowered into the grave in St. Louis on a wintry day late in 1874.[19]

It must be remembered that Scofield's chosen profession, the law, can be very lucrative, but only if a man sticks at it, endures lean years and builds up a practice based on confidence and mutual trust. Scofield barely scratched the surface of the income potential of a practice in

Kansas before he went into politics which, in its legitimate phases, was far less remunerative. From January 1874 on, we have no firm evidence of any earning capacity on Scofield's part.

Scofield became involved in questionable, even criminal activities, those already related and other possible ones as suggested in the *Atchison Patriot* story.[20] But late in 1879, he suddenly became acceptable in a group, a sub-culture utterly remote from any he had known or been in before.

The very sudden quashing of the criminal charges without proper adjudication suggests that Scofield's career was in the hands of someone who had clout never available to either Ingalls, Pomeroy or anyone of the Choteau Clan. But, that career was to be of such a nature that Leontine, the Catholic wife, had to go.

CHAPTER 11 NOTES

1. "Who's Who in America!", Vol. 7, 1912-1913, p. 1850.
2. See Chapter 10, Footnote 19.
3. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 26 and p. 40.
4. Papers on *Simpson vs. Scofield, Papin and Betts*, Case 44252, supplied by Circuit Court, Twenty-second Judicial Circuit of Missouri, Civil Courts Building, St. Louis, Missouri.
5. The *Atchison Patriot*, August 1881. See Chapter 13.
6. Papers on *McLean vs. Scofield and Papin*, Case 46633, source as above.
7. The court clerk was able to supply the transcript of the testimony for Case 44326, *Vollmer vs. Papin and Betts*, as well as copies of pleadings, subpoenaes, etc. Scofield's statement was quoted by Betts, transcript p. 13, as he was undergoing cross-examination by attorney Samuel Reber.
8. From documents supplied by the Circuit Court.
9. As stated by Vollmer in answer to a direct question by his attorney, Frank Taylor.
10. Transcript. p. 2 and p. 13. According to Betts, Scofield offered either his own horse and buggy or to pay the hire of a rig from a livery stable. The idea of Scofield owning a horse and buggy at this time seems unlikely. It was probably hired as part of a stage setting to impress the "hook" Vollmer.
11. Transcript, p. 26.
12. Transcript, p. 29.
13. Transcript, p. 25.
14. Transcript, p. 29. Cross examination by attorney Taylor.
15. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
16. We think specifically of a letter dated Jan. 23, 1974, from Dr. John A. Witmer, Librarian of Dallas Theological Seminary, to Mr. John H. Mize, heir of the Scofield daughters.
17. *Republican*, St. Louis, Nov. 7, 1879. Supplied by the Missouri Historical Society.
18. Letters to the writer from appropriate Canadian authorities.
19. The death occurred on Dec. 23, 1874. *The Choteau Family*, St. Louis, Mo., p. 106.
20. See Chapter 13.

CHAPTER 12

The Role of Tom McPheeters

"Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow."
Isa. 1:18

Back in the days when this writer was a Dispensationalist, it was customary to give personal testimonies which included the day, the hour and often the exact minute of conversion. Such precision is not possible in the case of C. I. Scofield, the man responsible for it all. It has generally been repeated that his conversion occurred at some time in 1879. Scofield so stated in "Who's Who in America, 1912."[1] Trumbull so indicated in his story.[2] But the only established dates of 1879 relating to Scofield tend to confuse the matter. The published story, when examined, leaves us in considerable doubt about what actually happened and when.

The story published in Trumbull's book appears to be the source of all the reports of Scofield's conversion. It reads:

> In his St. Louis law office, one day, McPheeters came to see him. After talking a while, McPheeters got up to go. With his hand upon the door-knob, he turned and faced Scofield, saying: "For a long time I have been wanting to ask you a question that I have been afraid to ask, but that I am going to ask now."
>
> "I never thought of you as 'afraid' " said Scofield in hearty friendship. "What is your question?"
>
> "I want to ask you why you are not a Christian?" came the unexpected reply.
>
> Now Thomas McPheeters was an outspoken Christian himself, utterly devoted to his Lord, and a real soul-winner, at the same time a society man in the best social life of his day. He and Scofield had much in common—except Christ.
>
> The lawyer replied thoughtfully: "Does not the Bible say something about drunkards having no place in heaven? I am a hard drinker, McPheeters."
>
> "You haven't answered my question, Scofield," the other man came back. "Why are you not a Christian?"
>
> "I have always been a nominal Episcopalian, you know," said Scofield, "but I do not recall ever having been shown just how to be a Christan. I do not know how."
>
> Now McPheeters had his answer. He drew up a chair, took a Testament out of his pocket, and read passage after passage from the precious Good News, plainly telling his friend how to be saved. "Will you accept the Lord Jesus Christ as your Saviour?" he asked.

> "I'm going to think about it," said Scofield.
>
> "No, you're not," answered McPheeters. "You've been thinking about it all your life. Will you settle it now? Will you believe on Christ now, and be saved?"
>
> The logical-minded, clear-thinking lawyer liked clean-cut statements and unequivocal questions and answers. After a moment's thought he looked his friend full in the face, and said quietly, "I will." The two men dropped down on their knees together. Scofield told the Lord Jesus Christ that he believed on Him as his personal Saviour, and before he arose from his knees he had been born again: there was a new creation, old things had passed away, behold, all things had become new.

Sometime after 1919, one B. McCall Barbour, related the story, making some modifications. Barbour's story has been picked up in a tract entitled *Christ the Cure*, issued by Good News Publishing Co., Westchester, Illinois. Another version appeared in 1934 in a periodical called *The World's Crisis*. Short pieces have appeared during the years as Scofield's role has been told.

The Trumbull story has one aspect which is somewhat objectionable. It related the story as it was a verbatim report of a completely private conversation. The other writers used the same technique. Now, the moment of conversion may be vividly etched on a convert's mind, but it is doubtful if Scofield's memory 40 years later justified use of the conversational form. Tape recorders were years in the future.

The story places the scene of conversion in Scofield's law office. But in the last chapter, we established that there is no record, in recognized sources of a Scofield law office in 1879 when the conversion supposedly took place. Deputies could not locate Scofield's office in 1877 or 1878. It must have passed out of existence almost before the ink was dry on the pages of the 1877 edition of the City Directory.

Another weakness in the story. Persons not admitted to the bar do not usually maintain law offices. We have established that Scofield was never admitted to the bar in Missouri.[3] He in effect confirms this by mentioning only the Kansas Bar in his entry in "Who's Who in America, 1912." Not only did the office not exist, but the justification for the office is impossible, legally and economically.

The "instrument" in the conversion only adds to the problem. Trumbull refers to Tom McPheeters as: ".. . . an outspoken Christian, himself, utterly devoted to his Lord, and a real soul-winner, at the same time a society man in the best sense of that word, mingling with the best social life of his day."[4] And he quotes a friend of McPheeters: "His life was *all* the Christian life, in business as elsewhere."[5]

This evaluation is confirmed by official sources in St. Louis. It is further supported by comments of those who know his descendants. McPheeters was a man who wanted and used only the best of everything; this tied in with his love of Jesus Christ. His business interests required

the best legal talent available from among the members of the bar in St. Louis.

Thus we consider it very unlikely that the man involved in the forgeries noted the previous chapter would have been given an opportunity to handle the legal business of McPheeters.[6] The two may have met more than once after 1879, but never as client and legal counsel.

By the time the story of Scofield's "conversion" in the "law office" received wide circulation, McPheeters had departed this life, well in advance of The Rapture. McPheeters' death occurred on October 5, 1909. He could not be reached to clarify any discrepancies.

The dating of the conversion should be simpler. BeVier assumes that it took place before the start of D. L. Moody's 1879-1880 evangelistic campaign.[7] Before the campaign, Moody held a preliminary meeting of ministers in St. Louis on Nov. 25, 1879.[8] Intimations are that Scofield was associated with the campaign virtually from its start. Hence, the conversion should have taken place before November 25. Scofield affirmed that he was 36 when he was converted. He reached that age on August 19, 1879. Thus we are limited to the period of Aug. 19 through Nov. 24.

But as late as November 6, Scofield was still involved with the courts in matters of forgery.[9] The disposition of the case does not accord with the action of a new convert trying to right matters as he embarks on his new life in Christ. The case of *Vollmer vs. Papin and Betts* (0 43326) did not have its final hearing until Nov. 18, 1879. The decision in that case did not, for Scofield, accord with the role and values of a new convert. And we are left with a very few days in November in which we might reasonably place the experience, if it occurred when and as related to Trumbull by Scofield.

Writing about an unrelated diary of some historic importance, which appeared in 1879, the reputed year of Scofield's conversion, historian Frank Maloy Anderson (University of Minnesota and Dartmouth College) noted:

> Many of their statements cannot be checked upon the evidence of other sources—"controlled" in the language of historical method. If a particular diary contains a good deal that cannot be "controlled"; if there is in it a good deal that other men might well have known and reported but did not; if, in a word, too much of it escapes "control", there then appears reasonable ground for distrust."[10]

Anderson was referring to a well-known bit of Lincolniana, "The Diary of a Public Man."[11] The matter of "control" which he discusses led him to declare that the "Diary" which had generally been accepted as source for a number of anecdotes about Lincoln, was a combination of fact and fabrication. His conclusion was reached because so many entries in the "Diary" failed the test of "control."

In the story of Scofield's conversion, we have a similar situation. Those "details" of the story which can be checked against the "control" of accepted public records do not support Scofield's story. Having applied "control," note Trumbull's comment regarding the incident:

> There have been all sorts of inaccurate and misleading stories of the conversion of Dr. Scofield. Passing from mouth to mouth, some of these have gained currency, and as he says himself, he long ago gave up hope of denying or correcting them. But these facts have been given here as they actually occurred, and as Dr. Scofield wishes them to be known.[12]

The principle of "control" does not support Trumbull, nor does it permit confirmation as factual that which Dr. Scofield wished to be known. Thus we still do not know the facts of the conversion of a man who had profound influence in an important segment of the church.

But we must give proper weight to a statement that John J. Ingalls (often referred to as sarcastic Mr. Ingalls) made in 1899:

> No man can doubt the efficacy of the scheme of Christian salvation with the record of Scofield in view."[13]

Speaking of the phenomenon of conversion, J. Gresham Machen said:

> They know that when on such and such a day they kneeled in prayer they were still in their sins, and when they rose from their knees they were children of God never to be separated from Him. Such experience is a very holy thing. But on the other hand it is a mistake to demand that it should be universal. There are Christians who can give day and hour of their conversion, but the great majority do not know exactly at what moment they were saved. The effects of the act are plain, but the act itself was done in the quietness of God.[14]

But to avoid bogging down on one incident, let us note: "The Lord knoweth them that are His. And, let everyone that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity" (*II Tim. 2:19*).

The unseemly haste to get Scofield's forgery cases off the court dockets without fair adjudication was a prelude to his entry into this new role as a Christian worker. For the next several years, his life in Christian service was under the aegis of Rev. James H. Brookes, pastor of the Walnut Street Presbyterian Church.

Brookes had accepted a prophetic view remarkably close to that of the Plymouth Brethren and Brethern leader John Darby. It has been claimed that Brookes and Darby had been in personal contact when Darby passed through St. Louis either in 1877 or on earlier trips.[15] Scofield always claimed Brookes as a "Father in the Faith." Brookes was one of the group instrumental in bringing D. L. Moody to St. Louis for the 1879-1880 campaign.

Scofield's acceptance as a worker in the campaign and his alleged move to a position close to D. L. Moody are a bit inexplicable. There

had been enough in the press, that, had Brookes any interest in integrity, he would have held a counseling session-in-depth with Cyrus.

No matter what Cyrus would have told Brookes, if Brookes had been reading anything in the newspapers except those items which confirmed his view of Matthew 24, he would have made a few inquiries about Scofield. A check as superficial as that made by a neighborhood grocer or butcher investigating a new charge account applicant would have produced evidence demonstrating Scofield's unfitness for Christian work until some matters had been cleared up, some restitution made.

From the Trumbull relation, we note that Scofield was, up to 1879, close to illiterate in things Christian.[16] Present research confirms Trumbull. Hence, it is not possible to establish exactly what service Scofield could have rendered to the Moody campaign which began in November 1879.

Writing in 1945, Oswald Allis indicated that he felt James H. Brookes was guilty of coverup in regard to the source of his prophetic ideas.[17] We submit that Brookes' coverup went a lot farther. He covered up the reason for the initiative which led him to accept and push Scofield, but probably the initiative did not start with Brookes.

Moody remained in St. Louis through April 1880. During that time Scofield's activities in the campaign made it possible for him to largely avoid facing the reality of securing an income for himself and for the support of his family left behind in Atchison in another faith.

BeVier seemed convinced that Scofield's time was divided between law practice and Christian work.[18] But even if Scofield's reputation had been clean, most of his law work would have had to have been limited to drafting of simple documents, wills and similar instruments. But such could produce little more than a pittance of an income. The description of the Christian work, outside the Moody campaign, suggests that originally it was something of a freelance variety without assured income.

Somehow or other, Scofield paid the rent on the room he occupied at 1000 Locust Street, St. Louis.[19] But there is no evidence that he was concerned about his legal or moral obligation for the support of Leontine, Abigail or Marie Helene. In fact, in 1881, the *Atchison Patriot* story reported that occasional amounts of money sent irregularly from St. Louis were minimal.[20] Mrs. Scofield's financial need in this period has been confirmed in conversation with those who knew her.

It was in this period that Scofield's ideas on prophecy began to take shape. Scofield credits Brookes for those ideas. We must note that the basic seed material planted by Brookes could only have grown into young plants by Scofield utilizing idle evenings in his rented room. And those evenings were available because Leontine was working hard and long hours at De Gignac's Millinery Trimmings store in Atchison to support the girls.[21]

A departure from the Scofield story is made here to note that Brookes' view of prophecy was not universally held at that time. His insistence, imparted to Scofield, on a failing, irrelevant church and a decaying world was influenced by selective consideration of the literary output of special interests who wanted a certain prophetic view disseminated and accepted. Brookes' prophetic direction was one result. But despite Darby's indefatigable labors, his views were not the only expression of Biblical Christianity.

Brookes' pastorate in St. Louis overlapped in time with the ministry of Friedrich A. Tholluck at the University of Halle, Germany. Tholluck, whose depth differs from the "prophecy buffs," taught something very different. In his study "Light from the Cross," he is quite explicit in his belief in a triumphant church prevailing on earth against Satan.[22] He is quite specific in placing the "Great Tribulation" in A.D. 70, rather than at a time when the expressways are to be littered with driverless autos. Now the failure of Tholluck's views to remain prevalent in the world-wide exchange of Christian truth, is due in large measure to the activities of prophecy buffs like Brookes, Darby and Scofield.

But back to Brookes' role in starting Scofield on the path to prominence in the milieu of the failing church. It seems that no one, Brookes, Scofield, or anyone else gave any consideration to the relevance of I Corinthians 7:14 in the Scofield marital tangle. Was Leontine sloughed off; were the girls sloughed off as predestined to be forever outside the Evangelical faith? The treatment would make a hyper-Calvinist shudder. Or did Brookes get a view of Leontine that suggested she was already beyond hope?

Following his role as a volunteer worker in the Moody campaign, Scofield became involved in the work of the YMCA, then a basically Fundamental organization. He became acting secretary of the YMCA, St. Louis, in August 1880.[23] If the law practice existed, it was not sufficiently pressing to intrude on the YMCA duties.

In July 1880, Scofield joined the Pilgrim Congregational Church of St. Louis. Dr. C. C. Goodell, the pastor, was a peronal friend of Brookes and appears from this distance to have been agreeable to Brookes' views on prophecy. Scofield thus resumed for another 30 years an association with the Congregational denomination. This had been the family religious connection from the arrival in Connecticut in the 1630's until the move to Michigan.

Not long after joining the church, Scofield engaged in a bit of public activity on its behalf. And here we have a case of stories, in later years, being told differently to different listeners. Trumbull notes a request from Goodell himself.[24] Luther Rees was told that the request came from Walter Douglas of the congregation.[25] Whatever the source, Scofield complied. He carried a sign (or transparency) through the

streets of downtown St. Louis advertising the evening service at Pilgrim. Scofield claimed that on that jaunt he never at one time saw so many of his society friends and "drinking companions." Those who knew of his relationship with the lack of concern for Leontine were probably not impressed.

Scofield's sister, Laura Marie Eames, and her husband were prominent residents of St. Louis. Emeline Papin and the third sister, Victorine Annan, were also living in St. Louis. Two of the three were never mentioned by Scofield as he related his life story to the Fundamentalist community. We have no inkling of what they thought of the new role of their brother who had had such a chequered career.

Unless Scofield had built up a cache of cash from adventures in forgery which never showed up on court dockets, in this period he must have lived on the generosity of Christians who were sympathizers with Moody's evangelism and Brookes' prophecy.

Shortly after the transparency incident, Walter Douglas introduced Scofield to the president of a railroad reaching the St. Louis area on the east side of the Mississippi. Douglas and Scofield suggested to the president (not identified) that Scofield be allowed to conduct services for the crews of that railroad's trains laying over between runs in East St. Louis, St. Clair County, Illinois. St. Clair County was then, as it is now, notorious for iniquity.

A bit of railroad history must be inserted at this point. James B. Eads, of St. Louis, almost single-handedly, constructed the first bridge crossing the Mississippi at St. Louis. When the bridge was completed in 1874, the Eastern Roads (known to the trade as "Official Territory" lines) refused to use the bridge. Goods and passengers continued to be dumped on the Illinois side to be ferried across the river in the primitive manner which had prevailed for years. It was uncomfortable for the passengers, it was costly, it was damaging to the goods. It was not even in the stockholders' interest as the tolls on Eads' bridge were about half the cost of operating the ferries. The obstinancy of the Official Territory Lines drove Eads into bankruptcy. Only then did the railroads evince any interest in the Eads bridge. By then, Eads had lost what he had dreamed of and worked for.[26]

The stubbornness of the Official Territory executives and their backers meant that the trainmen had to spend time between runs in a sinkhole of iniquity: East St. Louis. While St. Louis near the railroad terminals was not quite like what was later to be found in Ocean Grove, New Jersey, or Winona Lake, Indiana, it was far better than East St. Louis. The railroads for many reasons would have been wise to get the trains into St. Louis at the earliest opportunity. And, of course, Eads would not have lost his bridge.[27] Commendable as the unidentified president's agreement was to utilize Scofield's services, it was hardly

a responsible way to allievate a basically unnecessary problem. The president's alleged compassion for his crews is in marked contrast to his complacency about bankrupting James B. Eads.[28] Yet, this was a harbinger of the kind of social action which was to prevail in churches where Scofield's "leaven" was later to spread.

The results: little that was positive until Scofield befriended a sick conductor. That provided an opening and some "brands were snatched from the burning." But, as usual, with Scofieldian service, impact on society and on the particular problem was a bit less than minimal; a far cry from Pentecost.

About this same time, the St. Louis Association of the Congregational Church issued a "License to Preach" to Scofield.[29] So equipped, he organized and pastored the Hyde Park Congregational Church of St. Louis. He continued in that post until the summer of 1882. It was then that associates in the denomination suggested that Scofield might be the man for a vacancy in a Congregational work in Dallas, Texas. Dallas was, of course, farther from Atchison than St. Louis was.

CHAPTER 12 NOTES

1. "Who's Who in America, 1912," *loc. cit.*
2. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 28.
3. See Chapter 11.
4. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 27.
5. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 29.
6. Our evaluation of McPheeters is based on material in *St. Louis, the Fourth City*, Pictorial and Biographical Supplement, Vol. 1, (1912) made available by the Missouri Historical Society.
7. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 25, footnote 61. BeVier relies on Trumbull, p. 27–28. BeVier makes the flat statement that the conversion took place in September 1879, although Trumbull is less specific, stating that it occurred sometime in 1879.
8. From contemporary newspapers as checked by the Missouri Historical Society.
9. St. Louis *Republican*, November 7, 1879.
10. Frank Maloy Anderson, *The Mystery of "A Public Man", A Historical Detective Story*, University of Minnesota Press, 1948, p. 72.
11. Anderson in his work reproduces the "Diary" with the following note: "The Diary is reprinted in the following pages exactly as it originally appeared in the *North American Review*. The First Installment was printed in the August issue, 1879, Vol. 129, pp. 125–140. We have noted that *North American Review* was utilized by Ingalls to sustain the John Brown legend. More to our point, Anderson's detective work suggests that the "Diary" was a combination of fiction by and experiences of Sam Ward, often impecunious brother-in-law of Samuel Gridley Howe, one of The Secret Six. The fictional parts of the "Diary" have helped to cement in the public mind images which fit the picture desired by The Secret Six from the time they started their conspiratorial plans.
12. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 29–30.
13. *Kansas Topics, The Kansas City* (MO) *Journal*, December 28, 1899, p. 4.
14. J. Gresham Machen, *Christianity and Liberalism*, p. 140.
15. Sandeen, *op. cit.*, p. 74, notes that Darby made five trips to St. Louis including visits in 1872 and 1877. Darby carefully avoids being specific about his contacts in that

city and it is only by an inference made by Harry Ironside that the story of definite contact with Brookes gained circulation. Entirely typical of the mysterious way in which the Failing Church syndrome was spread.

16. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 34–35.
17. Oswald T. Allis, *Prophecy and The Church*, p. 13, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1945.
18. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 33.
19. *St. Louis City Directory*, 1881.
20. More in Chapters 13 and 14.
21. DeGignac was a dealer in millinery trimmings in Atchison, Kansas, where Leontine first found employment when she became aware that Cyrus would no longer support her.
22. *Light from the Cross*, Part II, *The Sufferings and Death of Christ*, Sermon VII, "The Command of Jesus 'Weep Not for Me, But for Yourselves,' " p. 189ff. Moody Press, Chicago, 1952. The writer's copy from Moody Press is a volume in "The Wycliffe Series of Christian Classics" and bears the names in the imprint of Wilbur M. Smith, S. Maxwell Coder and J. C. McCaulay. None of them appeared to have noted the extent to which Tholluck's Lecture is in conflict with significant portions of the Doctrinal Statement of Moody Bible Institute.
23. Material supplied by the Missouri Historical Society. Records of the YMCA itself do not go back that far.
24. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 37.
25. *Central American Bulletin*, September 1921, p. 3.
26. The writer's attention was first called to this detail of St. Louis history in Chapter XIII of *Road to the Sea, the Story of James B. Eads and the Mississippi River*, by Florence Dorsey, Rinehart and Company, New York, 1947. The matter is discussed in more detail in "Municipal Reference Bulletin," St. Louis, March 1927, and "Fifty Years of Transportation," Terminal Railroad Association of St. Louis. Also in Sharf, *History of St. Louis*.
27. Note that with the development of modern railroading, the lines did return to terminals on the Illinois side. Today yards such as Rose Lake, Gateway, Dupo and Ackerman are important links in the national transportation system. However, in the 1870's there was no excuse to refuse to use the bridge and drive Eads into bankruptcy.
28. See Dorsey, *op. cit.*
29. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

CHAPTER 13

The Heir of the Plymouth Brethren or "Meet Me in St. Louis"

"But ye, brethren, be not weary in well-doing."

II Thess 3:13

When convert Scofield in 1879 moved from forgery to Christian work, he found a niche in Christendom off the mainstream of recognized denominations. Scofield credits Presbyterian James H. Brookes with being his spiritual father. But he affiliated with the Pilgrim Congregational Church, pastor, Charles H. Goodell. That crossing of denominational lines was to occur at an accelerated rate in the years to come, much of it due to the influence of Scofield.

Convert Scofield "happened to be in the one city in North America which had been singled out by John Nelson Darby for concentrated "planting the seed' of Darby's special brand of Bible teaching. Oswald Allis notes that the "Brookes" Dispensational beliefs so closely resembled

> . . . those of the Brethren that it seems clear that they were largely derived from them, Brookes gave no credit for them to Darby or any of the Brethren. This may be due to the fact that there were associations with the name of Darby which Brookes wished to avoid.[1]

During the summer of 1872, Darby wrote of the situation in St. Louis: ". . . had good opportunities and I am in pretty full intercourse with those exercised, among whom are more than one official minister."[2] Harry Ironside claims that Darby preached in Brookes' pulpit. His statement is the only testimony we have of a link between Darby and Brookes.[3] That link, however, has been accepted as official by all concerned with the history of the movement.

The fact that Darby visited America went largely unnoticed in Dispensational circles for many years. Even today we cannot really trace Darby's movements on this side of the Atlantic. An attempt to use the datelines of his published letters to build an itinerary was inconclusive and produced nothing definitive. Note that it is evident that between the time the Gold Spike was driven at Promontory Point, Utah, in May of 1869 and Darby's last visit in 1877, he made more trips across the Great Plains on the new Union Pacific Railway than most Americans. The unusual nature of Darby's movements has been noticed by others. For instance, Robert L. Pierce in *The Rapture Cult*

comments on ". . . Darby's unusual mobility, for his day and time, and his seeming lack of financial problems."[4] All of which is most strange.

This has had some notice in Brethren circles. A Brethren writer, using in British manner the pen name of "Touchstone" commented:

> What strikes us as amazing is the swiftness in which doctrines unknown previous to Darby became so widely accepted as to be regarded as almost fundamental to the Christian faith.[5]

The more investigation, the more the mystery.

If one accepts official stories, and assumes only religious influences, the Brethren movement appears strongly British in origin. Actually it grew out of the intellectual ferment spun off by the French Revolution.[6] Among the names, we note Lacunza, Maitland, Newman (John Henry and Francis), Froude, Irving, Carlyle, Lady Powerscourt, Henry Drummond (the eccentric banker), the Frere Brothers (J. Hatley and J. Hookham) and Joseph Wolff.

A number of the figures (Darby and Banker Drummond, especially) had contacts on the Continent which are not fully explained even today. It was on the Continent that Brethrenism was spawned.

As Otto J. Scott and Ralph L. Rusk have noted, aiders and abetters of "The Secret Six" (*Chapter 8*) visited several of those listed.[7] All were very secret and kept so for contemporaries.

Thus we have the mystery of Brethren origination, the mystery of Darby and Brookes in St. Louis. There are other strange coincidences. Darby concentrated on an area in the United States which had strong connections with the Continent which had hatched ungodly ideas. It was in that city that he profusely scattered the seed which flowered into Dispensationalism. Is it another coincidence that the blossoming of Darby's movement in its American form was entrusted to a man based in St. Louis who had a "French Connection?" That man was C. I. Scofield.

Scofield spoke of Darby as ". . . the most profound Bible student of modern times. . . ."[8] Scofield could have studied Darby's voluminous writings. There is room for the possibility that they may have met. Dave MacPherson in *The Great Rapture Hoax* is quite sure that they did.[9] There was a period between the resignation and the career in forgery when they could have. Darby's last letter from North America on his last visit was written from Montreal just before he boarded ship for the final return to England. The date was just a few days after Scofield had "taken" Frank Vollmer with the forged note. A meeting during the 1877 visit would have occurred during the time Scofield was "using" the Boatmens' Bank to pass his "carefully made" notes. Such a meeting would indicate a dimension to Darby never before considered. The meeting may never have occurred.

But what were the beliefs, the distinctives which Brookes appears to have appropriated from Darby and which Scofield learned either by direct contact or from Brookes.

First, that the "Church is in ruins." To Darby, the Church had failed and was beyond hope. Darby further held that every previous system set up by God had failed and that the Church would go the same way.[10] This view just happens to impugn the character of God, suggesting that He is incapable of getting men to obey Him and to carry out His will. In this light the wonderful devotional writings of Darby seem like mere words. Darby's vision is not Christian but a westernizing of the Manichaean heresey which flows out of the Orient.

Just as Darby's teaching divided the Church, so it divided the Scripture and its application. Darby divided Scripture and time into periods called "Dispensations" in which he claimed God dealt differently with man that He did in the period before or after. He made a rigid division between the Old and New Testament except when he needed the Old Testament for purposes of his eschatology. Today followers of Darby's system tend to neglect the Old Testament and even parts of the New.

There was another dichotomy between law (Old Testament) and grace (New Testament). The effect of this dichotomy was to shift the moral scale in the direction of antinomianism. Darby called for a separation from the "world" in any form. Included was dress, pleasure, education and association. But his stricture against law has made conformity to the "world" easier, even quite normal.

Howard Rowdon in his *Origins of The Brethren* notes the Brethren view of separation as applied to the political realm. (This was never adopted in America to quite the degree it was in Britain):

> In fact, politically the Brethren attitude was negative. Newton argued that since the principles of national life were "essentially opposed to those of Christ" there was no alternative for the Christian to "protestation against evil and separation from it." No middle course is possible since "we cannot give ourselves two personalities" by acting in a Christian way as private individuals, and in an unchristian way as citizens.[11] Again, the study of prophecy demanded a course of separation from a world which was hastening to destruction.[12] "Is it fitting," asked J. L. Harris, "for heaven-born men to be worldly legislators and politicians?"[12] It was, of course, agreed that subjection to "the powers that be" is mandatory; but it was held that there was Scriptural warrant for a Christian attempting to secure privilege by political means, or administering political authority.[13] Scripture authorized Christians to exercise authority "in three special relations of Father, Husband, Master . . . but never as kings, magistrates, or as holding any authority in the world."[14] The resignations of positions already held which were inconsistent with those confictions was both enjoined and practiced. Further, it became customary for Brethren to decline the right to vote.[15] As for the obligation to submit to "the powers

that be," this was enjoined "entirely independent of their character and of circumstances."[16]

Darby's eschatology focused on the "Imminent Return," disregarding the implications of the Lord's words in Mark 13:31: "But of the day and that hour knoweth no man, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." Darby and followers expected the end of the age in the 19th Century. Writing in 1901, Blair Neatby in his *History of The Plymouth Brethren* said:

> If any one had told the first Brethren that three quarters of a century might elapse and the Church be on earth, the answer would probably have been a smile, partly of pity, partly of disapproval, wholly of incredulity. Yet so it has proved. It is impossible not to respect hopes so congenial to an ardent devotion; yet it is clear now that Brethrenism took shape under the influence of a delusion, and that delusion was a decisive element in all of its distinctive features.[17]

That includes features circulated in meetings in St. Louis.

Several writers, including Ernest Sandeen, have suggested that Darby did not understand the social position of the church and the nature of denominations in America.[18] Sandeen also suggests that Darby was concerned because those who accepted his teaching did not "come out" as whose who accepted did in Britain. But the situation in America was different, and Darby's program as carried out by the English Brethren could not have produced in America the results Darby wanted. Darby was not stupid.

Duncan McDougall suggests that a primary purpose of Darby's program was to detach spiritual, devoted people from the mainstream of Christendom.[19] The results have been disastrous for church, society and government in Britain. But 1877 was not quite the time for this in America.

The beliefs which Scofield overtly embraced were neither a return to First Century Christianity nor a development of the faith for which the Reformers and Puritans fought and gave their lives. It was a new thing of most strange origin.

CHAPTER 13 NOTES

1. Oswald T. Allis, *Prophecy and The Church*, P & R Publishing, 1945, p. 133. Allis, in turn quotes from Harry A. Ironside, *A History of The Plymouth Brethren*, Zondervan, p. 196. Allis notes that Ironside was in contact with the Brethren and seems to have had some access to facts not generally circulated. Ironside's claim is probably correct, but we find no justification for all the secrecy.
2. Letters of J. N. Darby, Morish Co., Vol. 2, p. 180.
3. As noted in Ernest Sandeen, *Roots of Fundamentalism*, p. 75.
4. Robert L. Pierce, *The Rapture Cult*, Signal Mountain, Tenn., 1978, p. 49.
5. *The Witness* (London), issue of July 1972, p. 261, from an article, "A Short-Lived Journal." G. D. C. Howley, then editor, has admitted to the article, using in typical British fashion, pen name "Touchstone."

6. Otto J. Scott, *The Secret Six*, Times Books, 1978, p. 99, and Ralph J. Rusk, *Life of Ralph Waldo Emerson*, p. 191–193. Emerson visited Irving and Carlyle. The role of "Sage of Concord," as Emerson is often called, should be corrected by some real debunking.
7. *Dr. C. I. Scofield's Question Box*, BICA, Chicago.
8. Dave MacPherson, *The Great Rapture Hoax*, New Puritan Library, Fletcher, N.C., 1983, p. 79.
9. A good analysis of "The Church in Ruins" is in *Backgrounds to Dispensationalism* by Clarence Bass, Eerdmanns, 1960, Chapter IV.
10. Harold Rowdon, *The Origins of The Brethren*, Pickering & Inglus, London, 1967, p. 304.
11. Rowdon is quoting *Christian Witness* IV, p. 265.
12. Rowdon quotes B. W. Newton, *Day of the Lord*, p. 21. The lecture which was published in that pamphlet was given soon after 1840.
13. J. L. Harris, in *Christian Witness*, Vol. I, pp. 458, 459.
14. Rowdon quotes P. F. Hall, *Discipleship*, p. 29.
15. A. Miller, *The Brethren (Commonly so-called)*, London, n. d.
16. J. L. Harris, in *Christian Witness*, I, 459, quoting Hall who deplored "the evil spirit of insubordination now so prevalent on all sides."
17. W. Blair Neatby, *A History of the Plymouth Brethren*, London, 1901, p. 3.
18. Sandeen, *op. cit.*, p. 79.
19. Rev. Duncan McDougall, *The Rapture of The Saints*, reprint by O. F. P. M. Publishers, Blackwood, N.J., 1970, pp. 44, 47.

CHAPTER 14

The Press and the Minister

"Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon."
II Sam. 1:20a

Scofield had received a fair amount of attention from the press during his short political life in Kansas. His sudden disappearance from the scene at the beginning of 1874 must have left editors wondering. Some may have known stories that discretion made it inadvisable to print. But the contrast between the politician of 1873, the "scalawag" of 1874 and the minister of 1881 was entirely too good for the press to ignore. A reporter from Atchison, working on a "Scofield story" made his way to St. Louis in the summer of 1881. On whose instigation?

His story, originally printed in the *Atchison Patriot* was picked up by the Topeka paper, The *Daily Capital*, on August 27, 1881, is as follows:

CYRUS I. SCHOFIELD IN THE ROLE OF A CONGREGATIONAL MINISTER

Cyrus I. Schofield, formerly of Kansas, late lawyer, politican and shyster generally, has come to the surface again, and promises once more to gather around himself that halo of notoriety that has made him so prominent in the past. The last personal knowledge that Kansans have had of this peer among scalawags, was when about four years ago, after a series of forgeries and confidence games he left the state and a destitute family and took refuge in Canada. For a time he kept undercover, nothing being heard of him until within the past two years when he turned up in St. Louis, where he had a wealthy widowed sister living who has generally come to the front and squared up Cyrus' little follies and foibles by paying good round sums of money. Within the past year, however, Cyrus committed a series of St. Louis forgeries that could not be settled so easily, and the erratic young gentleman was compelled to linger in the St. Louis jail for a period of six months.

Among the many malicious acts that characterized his career, was one peculiarly atrocious, that has come under our personal notice. Shortly after he left Kansas, leaving his wife and two children dependent upon the bounty of his wife's mother, he wrote his wife that he could invest some $1,300 of her mother's money, all she had, in a manner that would

return big interest. After some correspondence he forwarded them a mortgage, signed and executed by one Chas. Best, purporting to convey valuable property in St. Louis. Upon this the money was sent to him. Afterwards the mortgages were found to be base forgeries, no such person as Charles Best being in existence, and the property conveyed in the mortgage fictitious. While Cyrus I. Scofield lay in the St. Louis jail, charged and convicted of forgery, he came under the notice of the St. Louis Flower Mission, and a young and beautiful girl, the only daughter of a wealthy St. Louisian, was in the habit of visiting the jail every day, or nearly so, in the interest of the mission, and giving Cyrus a bouquet. The acquaintance thus made behind the bars soon ripened into love, and the girl became madly infatuated with the object of her missionary work.

In the latter part of his confinement, Schofield, under the administration of certain influences, became converted, or professedly so. After this change of heart his wealthy sister came forward and paid his way out by settling the forgeries, and the next we hear of him he is ordained as a minister of the Congregational church, and under the chaperonage of Rev. Goodell, one of the most celebrated divines of St. Louis, he causes a most decided sensation. In the meantime the courtship between himself and the pretty young representative of the Flower Mission continued, Schofield representing first that his wife had obtained a decree of divorce. When the falsity of this story was ascertained by inquiries of our district clerk, he started on another that a divorce would be obtained, that he loved his children better than his life, but that the incompatibility of his wife's temper and her religious zeal in the Catholic church was such that he could not possibly live with her.

A representative of the Patriot *met Mrs. Schofield today, and that little lady denies, as absurd, such stories. There was never any domestic clouds in their homes. They always lived harmoniously and pleasant. As to her religion, she was no more zealous than any other church member. She attended service on the sabbath, and tried to live as becomes a christian woman and mother. It was the first time she had ever heard the objection raised by him. As to supporting herself and the children, he has done nothing, said the little woman. Once in a great while, say every few months, he sends the children about $5, never more. "I am employed with A. L. de Gignac & Co., and work for their support and mine. As soon as Mr. Schofield settles something on the children to aid me in supporting them and giving them an education, I will gladly give him the matrimonial liberty he desires. I care not who he marries, or when, but I do want him to aid me in giving our little daughters the support and education they should have.*[1]

(Note that the reporter committed an error frequently made, even today, placing an "h" in the name. There is, however, no question about

the identity of the subject.) It looks as though the reporter felt that he could not write a story about "clerical errors" without including an attempted or actual violation of the Commandment. Inaccuracy in media is not a late 20th Century phenomenon,. *The Atchison Patriot's* reporter's attempt on Scofield did not quite succeed.

On September 9, 1881, *The Atchison Patriot* published this letter from Mrs. J. H. Barnard, president of the St. Louis Flower Mission:

> Sirs:
>
> In your August 26th paper I found an account of the exploits on one Cyrus I. Schofield, and a little romancing in which one of the young ladies of our St. Louis Flower Mission is implicated. Usually I think it better to let those things rest, but thought it best to make a correction in your paper. For four years our Mission has not visited any of the penal institutions of our city, though we have entree to all of them. About four years ago some women visited prisoners under the guise of the Flower Mission and introduced saws, files and the like in the bouquets of flowers; fortunately the plot was discovered, we of course being fully exonerated and a request to continue our work extended to us.
>
> Having our hands full in the hospitals we relinquished the jail and hence could not have had one of our ladies there within the past year.
>
> I am assured, sir, you will be happy to make this explanation quite as publically as you have made the objectionable statement. On some of your visits to our city we shall be happy to meet you at our rooms, and you will judge for yourselves whether or not our ladies could be so frivilous. Be so good as to send me the number of your paper making this correction, and greatly oblige,
>
> Yours respectfully,
> Mrs. J. H. Barnard
> President Flower Mission
> 1819 Washington Avenue, St. Louis, Missouri[2]

BeVier, in his 1960 thesis, noted the first *Atchison Patriot* story but dismissed it as largely fabrication with intent to slander.[3] Mrs. Barnard's letter did not come to light until late 1984. While it does not affect the main thrust of the story it does invalidate the "juiciest" item in the sordid tale. For this we can be thankful, for it precludes gossipy-minded Fundamentalists from dwelling on a common error (especially in the late 1980's), not the more sophisticated Scofield deviations.[4] But it still leaves an impression that Scofield's lifestyle was hardly that of a consecrated servant of the Most High God.

It is evident that *The Atchison Patriot* story circulated in St. Louis, more widely than just among the exchanges of the newspapers. This heightens the probability that Brookes and Goodell read the story, even if Scofield had enough clout to keep it out of the St. Louis papers. Since both ministers would have been in a position to know the facts, we feel that a published denial of the story from either a Presbyterian or Congregational source would have been considered inadvisable for the future of Dispensationalism.

One error of the *Patriot* reporter may have been a serious one for Scofield research. The "Chas. Best" who the reporter declared non-existent was undoubtedly an incorrect reference to Charles F. Betts, who drove the buggy out to Webster Grove. Too bad, the reporter was looking for "Best" and not "Betts." We somehow feel that any typical reporter would have had real rapport with Betts. There might have been a longer story in the *Patriot.*

Leontine was such a lady that she never mentioned embezzlement from Mrs. Cerré. Of course, the fictional Chas. Best could have been part of such an embezzlement scheme. The similarity in name to the real estate agent from 8th Street could have been a ploy to ease negotiation of fraudulent instruments.

When the story of D. L. Moody's funeral and the clergymen who officiated was circulated in 1899, it brought stories about Scofield to the surface again. On December 28, 1899, *The Kansas City Journal* published the following item on its page 4:

The pastor who delivered the sermon and presided at the funeral of Dwight L. Moody, the famous evangelist, was Rev. C. I. Scofield. Some of the readers of The Journal may have recognized this name, but probably few will recall that Scofield was formerly of Kansas and figured prominently in politics. Originally he came from Tennessee, and during the war of the rebellion, he served with the Confederate forces, being a member of the Seventh regiment of Tennessee volunteers. He was drawn to Kansas by reason of the fact that his wife was one of the heirs of Regis Loisel, the intrepid Frenchman whose descendants were permitted to select 38,000 acres of land in Nemaha and other Kansas counties in lieu of a grant of which Loisel had held the title at the date of his death. Hon. John J. Ingalls was attorney for Mrs. Scofield, who was a native of St. Louis and a direct heir of the dead Frenchman, and, in turn, Mr. Scofield became a warm admirer of the brilliant Kansas senator.

Scofield landed in Nemaha County in 1872, just in time to be nominated on the Republican ticket for member of the legislature. He was elected, and, though ostensibly a supporter of Senator Pomeroy, he became largely instrumental in causing the election of Ingalls. Indeed, he was recognized as one of the foremost leaders in the Ingalls camp and by some as Ingall's personal representative, and in reward for his services he was made United States district attorney for the state. But he did not hold this office long. He was ousted in disgrace on account of some shady financial transactions which left him indebted in a number of thousands to a score of prominent Republicans. One of his victims once said to Topics:"

The way Scofield got our money—and he plucked $2,000 of mine—was by intimating that it was needed by Senator Ingalls, who would see

that it was paid. We knew that Ingalls was good, and we supposed that on account of his official position he did not care to be known in a money-borrowing transaction and was doing the business through a friend.

In due time, however, the shady nature of Scofield's financial transactions became known to Ingalls and the money lenders and then followed an explosion which compelled Scofield to resign his federal office and leave the state. From Kansas he went to St. Louis, and, shortly after his arrival there, he was lodged in jail on a charge of forgery, preferred by his own sister. At this point in his checkered life began his religious career, for when he emerged from confinement he was an enthusiastic Salvationist. While in jail he had been visited by a band of Christian women who prayed with him and worked his conversion, and upon his release he entered the Congregational ministry. His first pastorate was at Dallas, Tex., where he built up one of the wealthiest and most aristocratic church organizations in the state. In the meantime his Kansas wife had secured a divorce (she still lives in Atchison) and he married a fine woman in Texas who was prominent in his church.

Almost at once Scofield became a noted expositor of the Bible, and, after he had attracted the attention of Evangelist Moody, he was given the chair of Bible history in Moody's Northfield Bible school, as well as the pastorate of the Northfield Congregational church. He became the author of a number of tracts and volumes of sermons, and under his name are now printed regular issues of Bible lessons and studies.

When approached by his Kansas creditors Parson Scofield declares that he is poor and unable to pay, but he has never failed to do the right and easy thing by renewing his notes. So far as those who know him best are able to judge, his conversion is of an enduring nature, and, as once remarked by his old friend and supporter, the sarcastic Mr. Ingalls, "No man can doubt the efficacy of the scheme of Christian salvation with the record of Scofield in view."[5]

The 1899 story may help clear up the mystery surrounding events in Kansas at the end of 1873. If Scofield had defrauded the leading Republican politicians of Kansas, obviously, he "had to go." But these same Republican leaders could not afford to have it known publicly that they had been involved. This being so, the only course was to have Scofield "disappear," allowing the scandal to blow over. There is nothing recorded which makes that scenario impossible.

The "prominent Republican" and the reporter from Kansas City were neither more nor less accurate than their present day counterparts. The "prominent Republican" could at least be excused on the grounds of memory—a quarter of a century had passed since the events he was relating had occurred.

The "prominent Republican" of 1899 accepts the "juicy" item from the original story. Either Mrs. Barnard's denial was not widely noted

(somehow denials always have poorer circulation than original stories) or else there were other instances of irregularities. Mrs. Barnard properly wanted her mission cleared. But both stories refer to a jail term which would have been *after* the close of the 1879-1880 Moody St. Louis campaign. The official prison record has not been located, but it could have happened. It would not be out of keeping with the character of our subject.

The *Atchison Patriot* reporter has given us a story which the "prominent Republican" accepted, suggesting that it had a somewhat more than limited acceptance in the 1880's. The story is that of the girl from the Flower Mission. The continued acceptance of the Flower girl incident does suggest the possibility of things just below the surface. We would leave them there until we can get the eschatology straightened out.

The story of Scofield's rather casual extension of notes, which had ostensibly been made to repay funds embezzled, does not surprise. It is entirely congruent with the antinomian nature of Dispensationalism which Scofield inherited from J. N. Darby. Instead of allowing the legal obligation to expire with the statute of limitations, Scofield tolled the statute with the notes even though he could not have any intention of repayment. He was always quite casual about legal documents. The contact with McPheeters appears to have made no change.

In answer to any charge that we give too much credence to unsupported newspaper reports, we ask the Dispensational community if the story of Tom McPheeters in the law office is any less unsubstantiated than the Flower Mission girl story.

It is not entirely clear what the reporters of 1881 or 1899 hoped to accomplish by publishing the Scofield stories. If they had any hopes of awakening the church, they were sadly mistaken. The matter had been taken out of their hands years before by the inherent nature of the religious system of James H. Brookes and C. I. Scofield.

Typical of the phenomenon, John Cumming, a British pastor who shared Scofield's views, said in the 1850's regarding news and newspapers:

> . . . but I think that the newspaper of the nineteenth century is man unconsciously recording "It is done." God writes the prophecy; the journalist steps in, and without thinking of the prophecy, testifies its complete and magnificent fulfilment.[6]

In effect, Cumming suggests that the news is to be interpreted with J. N. Darby's view of Matthew 24 as the overriding standard, with events at the Eastern end of the Mediterranean as the only important items. In such a situation, facts are irrelevant, values passé and fable rampant. No one in the churches supporting Scofield paid any attention to newspaper reports.

No record of the appearance of the *Atchison Patriot* story in the St. Louis newspapers has been turned up, but St. Louis editors must have noted the story as Kansas papers crossed the exchange desk. Possibly that special providence which is alleged to watch over drunks, children and idiots kept the story out of the St. Louis papers. Or more prosaicly, whoever was nurturing the career of C. I. Scofield may have had enough clout to let the St. Louis editors know that publication of the *Atchison Patriot* story was inadvisable.

In the fundamentalist story of the conversion, referred to in the last chapter, there is one recurring reference to the "old" Scofield which the press never picked up. Trumbull very carefully developed the story that the Scofield who entered the Moody Campaign in late 1879 was a just-dried-out drunk who straightened out under the influence of Tom McPheeters. The careful development by Trumbull is so reasonable to those who know the history of the mores of the Old Frontier. To place Scofield in the 1870's, Trumbull said:

> The moderate use of liquor was a commonplace in the life in which he moved and had been reared. He drank as he pleased, and, like most men who drink "in moderation," he soon drank too much.[7]

Before world grain markets developed, distilling was a most efficient way to prepare grain for transportation—and some was duly transported down throats. We can be sure that the men who participated in the Pomeroy-Ingalls battle for the Senate seat in January 1873 consumed great quantities of alcoholic beverages made from Kansas grain—and Scofield was among them. But even this does not inevitably make a man an alcoholic.

Trumbull took a bit on himself to make Scofield both a drunk and a successful lawyer acceptable to a businessman like Tom McPheeters. It is here that we detect a thread of fable.[8] Scofield was probably well-known in saloons in the vicinity of Betts' real estate office on 8th Street, but his forgeries suggest a rather clear head.

Reporters, especially in the 1879's, were quite proud of their ability to handle their liquor, but they were ruthless when someone fell under the "influence," especially when there was something else to use against a prominent figure. And a story of drunkenness is the second-best thing a reporter can use to run down a cleric. The rather weak pass at the "first" thing suggests that our Scofield was a bit abstemious where failings of the flesh here concerned.

The story of Scofield's drunkenness may have been part of the package of merchandising that elevated Scofield to such prominence in Fundamental circles. After 1879, Scofield's associations were almost entirely in groups where beverage alcohol was taboo and where a man was considered a hopeless drunk after the second drink. In such a

setting the value of a victory over "demon rum" would be tremendous. Important circulation of the story of the "victory" over drunkenness came as the Premillenial portion of the church was accelerating its retreat from social responsibility. This retreat included a breathless wait for "The Rapture."

There was another value to the story. Just in case rumors of a past life which did not meet Fundamentalist standards should surface, the "drunkenness story" was ready. It was tailor-made to preserve Scofield's image as "Mr. Clean" or more properly "Mr. Cleaned-up" to his Dispensational following.

CHAPTER 14 NOTES

1. From the files of the Kansas State Historical Society.
2. From the Atchison Public Library.
3. BeVier, *op. cit.*, pp. 28-30.
4. The writer has known devout Evangelical matrons, who, hearing of a marital deviation, have, with seeming innocence, asked, "Please tell me more so that I can pray more intelligently!"
5. Newspaper from the files of the Kansas City (Mo.) Public Library.
6. Rev. John Cumming, D. D., The End, or the *Proximate Signs of The Close of This Dispensation*, John P. Jewett & Company, Boston, 1855, p. 15. (This American edition followed shortly the original British printing.)
7. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 25.
8. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 29 noted: "There have been all sorts of inaccuracies and misleading stories of the conversion of Dr(*sic*) Scofield."

CHAPTER 15

A Bill of Divorcement

> *"Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives, but from the beginning it was not so."*
>
> Matt. 19:8

To fully appreciate the portion of the Scofield story related in this chapter, the reader should try to think in terms of the values of a century ago. This means thinking of things as they were accepted before the media were the arbiters of moral values. The breaking up of a marriage would hardly cause raised eyebrows today in the most strict Evangelical circles, but Scofield's position must be judged in the light of the values of the Victorian predecessors of the Fundamentalists.[1] The War Between the States had produced some shift in the views of society and of church people on the matter of divorce, but in most churches, especially those which Scofield served and was to serve, the view was essentially a simplistic, literal application of the words of Jesus Christ Himself, as recorded in Matthew 19, *viz:*

1. Marriage is for life—until death did part *(vss. 4,6).*
2. Necessity for divorce meant the presence of serious emotional, psychological and spiritual problems *(vs. 8).*
3. Remarriage, especially for the legal defendant, was forbidden *(vs.* 9).

Even nearly a century later, we can find pertinent comments from a columnist in the British magazine *Observer.* One especially has particular application to C. I. Scofield. Katharine Whitehorn, in her column of December 11, 1966, wrote:

> I cannot help feeling it odd that divorce is talked of in enlightened circles as if it were a benefit that should be available to all, rather than a tragedy that it is worth almost anything to avoid.[2]

Ten months later, on October 1, 1967, she wrote:

> . . . I would like, just once, to hear someone say of a man who has left his wife and four fat babies right in the middle of the kitchen floor, *not* that he's been through a hard time lately . . . ; but simply "You louse!"[3]

The *Atchison Patriot* reporter noted that Scofield said: ". . . he loved his children better than his live, but that the incompatability of his wife's temper and her religious zeal in the Catholic Church was such that he could not possibly live with her. . . ."[4] If the reporter correctly repeated Scofield's comments on the marital situation, we are led to wonder how diligent Scofield had been in really digging into the

Scriptures. His statement is in conflict with what the Holy Spirit had Paul write in I Corinthians 7:14b: "... and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: else were your children unclean; but now are they holy." Possibly Scofield's Bible study had not included the Letter to the Corinthians. Or could it be that Scofield found a Catholic wife an encumbrance in his new role as a Protestant cleric "free from the law?" He was to give much credit for his theology to the Plymouth Brethren. Maybe in the matter of Leontine, he felt that he was quite literally acting according to one of the Brethren's favorite verses which reads: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteoussness? and what communion hath light with darkness?" *(II Cor. 6.:14)*

Cyrus' ability (and possibly intent) to make regular provisions for his family virtually ended with the spending of the money from his last salary check for the district attorney post in January 1874. (We are now in the early 1880's.) Apparently Leontine had to call on Cerré family resources. Eventually she went out and worked to support herself and her daughters. Her mother was by this time living in Atchison.

In those Victorian days, opportunity for a respectable woman in need to earn a living was limited. A. L. de Gignac & Company dealt in millinery trimmings, materials with which women were familiar.[5] Leontine was employed there at the time the reporter from the *Patriot* was working on the important story. His interview with Leontine produced nothing which would flatter Cyrus' image.

Store hours in those days were long. After a day on her feet Leontine must often have returned in complete exhaustion. Then she must have been extremely grateful for Mrs. Cerré's presence in her home. But remember that on those same evenings when Leontine was so exhausted from carrying the responsibilities dropped by Cyrus, Cyrus had either been basking in the public eye, sharing a platform with D. L. Moody, or digging into his Bible to prove that the world was getting worse and would soon end. As Cyrus was revelling in his first steps in the "failing Church" syndrome, he may not have realized how aptly one of his favorite passages described him. Paul in II Timothy 3:2, 3 says that: "... men shall be lovers of their own selves ... without natural affection ... boasting."

Leontine must have become pretty well disgusted with Cyrus by mid-1881, just about the time he was licensed to preach. She defied custom and had divorce papers drawn up. The original pleading, Atchison County divorce case No. 2181, was sworn to by Leontine Scofield on 23 July 1881. It seems likely that the reporter from the *Patriot* talked to Leontine sometime in August, after he had been to St. Louis. Even making allowance for reportorial license, what he reported was not conventional for a man who had just been "set aside" as having a special calling to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

According to the entry on the jacket of the docket, the papers in case No. 2161 were not filed until December 9, 1881. In the papers, Leontine charged that Cyrus had "... absented himself from his said wife and children, and had not been with them but abandoned them with the intention of not returning to them again."[6] And she further charged that he:

> ... has been guilty of gross neglect of duty and has failed to support this plaintiff or her said children, or to contribute thereto, and has made *no* provision for them for food, clothing or a home, or in any manner performed his duty in the support of said family although he was able to do so.[6]

Trumbull ignores, or was unaware of this part of the story. BeVier tends to pooh-pooh the story that Leontine's financial state was quite desperate at the time[7] The *Atchison Patriot* story is definite on that point, taking a position quite different from BeVier. Those who were close to the family have been definite in telling the writer that Leontine was quite poor at the time she accepted the finality of separate existence and the permanent role of the sole support of her daughters. Leontine was such a lady that except for the statement in her petitions and the comments just noted, little has come down about all she endured during this trying time.

In response to Leontine's petition, a reply was filed for Cyrus by Attorney Thomas Metcalfe. It read:

> Now comes Defendant C. I. Scofield and enters his appearance and for answer to Plaintiff's petition herein denies each and every allegation and averment made and contained therein and prays to be hence dismissed with Judgment for costs.
>
> C. I. Scofield
> by Thos. Metcalfe, his Atty.[8]

The court agreed with Leontine and issued a decree of divorce, noting that Cyrus was: "... not a fit person to have custody of the children."[9] But it did permit the granting of visitation privileges to Cyrus, besides ordering payment of alimony and support.

For reasons not made clear in surviving documents, that decree never became final. On March 4, 1882, on a postcard size bit of paper, Attorney Metcalfe on Cyrus' behalf sent the following request from St. Louis to the Atchison County Court:

> In case of Scofield vs. Scofield for divorce, Mr. Scofield withdraws his appearance and answer and desires the case dismissed as to him. Please withdraw answer and appearance and oblige.
>
> Yours truly
> Thos. Metcalfe
> Atty. for Deft.[10]

The request was granted. Leontine withdrew her petition and *Scofield vs. Scofield* remained, as did the principals, in a state of limbo. There

are rumors of a reconciliation between Cyrus and Leontine. However, such a reconciliation would have exposed Catholic Leontine to the Protestant groups to whom Cyrus was ministering. The events narrated in Chapters 12 and 17 indicate that she remained hidden as far as Cyrus' congregations were concerned.

It is possible that the progress of legal proceedings was influenced by major events in Cyrus' life. Cyrus made a change in his field of ministry in 1882, locating in Dallas, Texas.

In 1883 the post of librarian, Atchison Public Library, became vacant. Leontine obtained the position, ending her connection with de Gignac store. She retained the post of librarian until she retired in 1917.

Possibly Leontine felt that she should now regularize her situation. For whatever reason, on October 1, 1883, she filed a second petition for divorce. Docketed as case No. 2681, the working of her petition was substantially the same as the one of two years earlier. The action means that Cyrus Ingerson Scofield was ordained to the Christian ministry while he was the defendant in a divorce action. The matter of the ordination is related in Chapter 17.

Case No. 2681 was decided on the 8th day of December 1883. The divorce was granted. The original decree has been preserved with the docket. The copy contains the phraseology that Cyrus "was not a fit person to have custody of the children" and forbade him to interfere with their rearing. The papers make no mention of alimony or support payments. Leontine may have decided that fighting Cyrus over this was not worth the effort. Of course, Cyrus' position in the areas of Christian service would have made such payments socially awkward as well as economically unlikely.

The reader must remember that here we are relating actions and omissions on the part of a man supposedly four-years-old in the Christian life, considered by some of his peers of sufficient spiritual maturity to stand for ordination to the Christian ministry. Yet he was giving no sign of willingness to accept his legal and moral responsibilities to his wife and daughters.

Paul writing to Timothy said: "But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel" *(I Tim.* 5:8).

Yet, this was exactly what Scofield was doing and continued to do as far as Leontine, Abigail and Marie Helene were concerned. Note also that it is most likely that Scofield had to engage in calculated deception to be accepted as a "Shepherd of the Flock."[11] Whether the professional "prophecy buffs" who pushed Scofield along were as unknowing as the folks in the pews cannot readily be determined a century later.

Scofield did manage to keep Leontine hidden from the purchasers of his Bible. The facts have gradually leaked out and have caused, as intimated in the beginning of this chapter, no concern among his following. To some extent this is a fruit of Scofield's teaching of a failing church and decaying world. That teaching has sapped the moral fibre of the church.

The severance of the relationship between Cyrus and Leontine was for Cyrus just another step on the road to bigger and better things. We have found no evidence that Scofield had the slightest twinge of remorse except possibly in the very last months of his life.

CHAPTER 15 NOTES

1. The term "Fundamentalist" was not coined until about 1910. Scofield and his close supporters held views which were similar to those later shaped into that movement. Scofield himself helped bring the term into Christendom. "Fundamentalism" has claimed to be orthodox Christianity, but its shape was determined by entry into Biblical Protestantism of certain elements, that entry being aided by highly questionable characters, including the subject of this study.
2. *The Observer,* London, 11 December 1966, quoted in *Christian Counterattack* by Lunn and Lean, Blandford Press, Ltd., London, 1969, p. 28.
3. *The Observer,* London, 1 October 1967, quoted in Lunn and Lean, op. *cit.*, p. 28.
4. The *Atchison Patriot* story reproduced in full in previous chapter.
5. Information on de Gignacs supplied by Mr. Art. Metz, Atchison, Kan.
6. Quoted from the papers in case No. 2161, supplied by the Atchison County Court.
7. In Trumbull, *op cit.,* the impression is given that Cyrus was a bachelor during those years although that term is never used. For BeVier's comment on Leontine's financial state, see BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 29.
8. Records in case No. 2161.
9. *Ibid.*
10. Copies of papers making up Docket in case No. 2681 supplied by The Atchison County Court.
11. A newspaper report, published in *The Daily Times Herald,* Dallas, Texas, May 30, 1926, five years after Scofield's death claimed that he revealed his entire life to the ordination council. As the matter is discussed in Chapter 17, we consider this highly unlikely; in fact, we hold that statements made at the council as well as his Confession of Faith were masterpieces of cover-up.

CHAPTER 16

The Fate of the First Family

"She looketh to the ways of her household and eateth not the bread of idleness."

Prov. 31:27

Before resuming the narrative of the life of Cyrus as he pursued his course toward the role of the Matthew Henry of the Progressive Era, let us relate the story of Leontine and the girls to its conclusion.

By diligent effort and careful mangement, Leontine was able to get her household established on a going basis. Matters improved after she was appointed to the post of librarian. The two girls received the best schooling possible up to and including high school. But more than schooling contributed to the development of the girls. Leontine's essential gentility and culture helped shape the lives of her daughters. Her reputation in Atchison was that she was a wonderful mother.[1] Already noted was the help provided by her widowed mother, Helene LeBeau Cerré during the crucial days of the early 1880's. Mrs. Cerré remained in Atchison with Leontine until her death on March 28, 1892.[2]

Leontine's position in the library made it possible for her to form friendships which endured for years and which probably would not have been made in other lines of endeavor. She is remembered for possessing the gaiety and vivacity characteristic of the French. Various clippings and letters suggest that Mrs. Scofield continued in contact with both the Pomeroy and Ingalls families, friends from the early days in Atchison. Comment did reach this writer that she was at times tempermental, but one must remember her Gallic heritage.

The oldest daughter, Abigail, taught in the elementary schools in Atchison after she graduated from high school. She became acquainted with Dr. Edward Lincoln Kellogg, a dentist in Atchison and a prominent member of the Trinity Episcopal Church. They were married on June 23, 1902, in St. Benedicts Catholic Church, Atchison.[3]

After a few years, Dr. Kellogg's health failed. The couple moved to West Plaines, Missouri, and shortly thereafter to San Luis Obispo, California, to benefit Dr. Kellogg's health. Mrs. Kellogg followed in her mother's footsteps by becoming librarian of the Public Library in San Luis Obispo. Through contacts she made there, she became one of the most popular residents of the community. Abigail was known as a gracious and pleasant person with many interests reflecting an active mind.

Helene became a teacher of French at the Barstow School of Girls in Kansas City, Kan. On October 4, 1918, she was married to J. Wheeler Barlow of Atchison. The ceremony took place in the Westminister Congregational Church, Kansas City. The pastor, Rev. Morris H. Tuck, officiated. A contemporary newspaper account lists the guests: Mrs. Leontine Scofield, Rev. Otis E. Gray of Atchison, Dr. and Mrs. E. G. Blair, Rev. and Mrs. Robert Mize, Mr. and Mrs. Harry T. Abernathy, Miss Rosa A. Witham, Miss Miriam Babbitt of Kansas City. The list has been placed here to point out the conspicuous absence of the bride's father, Rev. Cyrus Ingerson Scofield, who never had the experience of the proud father who "gives away" his daughter to the man who won her heart.

The couple honeymooned by a motor trip to St. Louis and Kentucky, traveling in the groom's Stutz Bear-Cat Roadster,[4] Barlow was vice-president of Blish, Mize and Silliman Hardware Co., of Atchison,[5] His mother was a sister of Mrs. Parsh D. Blish, wife of one of the firm. He had spent part of his youth at the Blish home at 300 R Street, Atchison. The R Street property ran through to Riverside Drive, providing an outstanding site for a gracious home. It was there that the three Scofield women were to live out the closing days of their lives.

One of Barlow's interests was the Bar Wood Farm in Atchison County. Helene shared his interest in the ranch where pure bred cattle were raised. Among Helene's other interests, she was a member of the Atchison Library Association and on the Library Board. The Barlows played a significant role socially in Atchison.

The available material gives little that is precise on when Cyrus resumed relations of any sort with his daughters. There are intimations that he was ready to move as soon as the girls' legal majorities made the Court Order of 1883 moot. They may not have been appreciated by the second Mrs. Scofield. One surviving bit of evidence is a letter in Cyrus' own handwriting on his personal letterhead, dated in 1909. The letter gives evidence that he had by that time achieved substantial "victory over humility." The letter will be discussed in Chapter 32, but at this point note that the letter fails to show any concern about the very substantial differences between the faith for which he had become world-famous and that believed in and practiced by his ex-wife and daughters.

Leontine retired from her post at the library in 1917 at the age of 69. She made her home with the Barlows on R Street. Children of people who had been her patrons at the library frequently came to see her. During her retirement she made a number of trips to California to visit Abigail and Edward. Leontine's brother, Henry, passed away on April 9, 1926. No doubt as the older generation passed on, she drew closer to the girls.

On October 27, 1936, the girls hosted a dinner for their mother's 88th birthday. Leontine had remained a devout Catholic and among the guests were her particular friends, the Revs. Richard Burns and Matthew Hall. Two days later, Leontine was stricken with a heart attack. This was followed by pneumonia. She passed away on Friday, November 6, 1936. Burial was in Mount Calvary Cemetery, Atchison.[8] Interestingly enough, items published at the time of her death, and even items about Leontine published after Cyrus' death in 1921, referred to Leontine as if she had been the *only* Mrs. Scofield.

Abigail's husband, Dr. Kellogg, died on January 5, 1935 in California. His remains were brought to Atchison for internment. Abigail continued to live in California until 1941. When she left to return to Atchison, she was honored at a community gathering and presented with a gift to mark her years of dedication to the library.

J. Wheeler Barlow died on July 7, 1941. It was his passing that prompted Abigail to return to Kansas and live with Helene. The two women maintained the house on R Street for more than 16 years.

On December 10, 1957, Abigail, 87 years old, entered Atchison Hospital. Helene went along to be with her sister. Helene became ill shortly before the end of 1957 and passed away on January 8, 1958. Rev. Matthew Hall, her mother's friend, officiated at the funeral on January 8 at St. Joseph's Church. Her remains were placed alongside those of her mother in Mount Calvary Cemetery.[7] Abigail remained critically ill until she passed away on February 27, 1958. Rev. Matthew Hall conducted services for her at St. Joseph's on March 1, 1958. Neither woman had any children and Scofield's line through Leontine ended with their deaths.

So great was the esteem in which these three women were held in Atchison, that when this writer commenced gathering material for this work, he found that they were still being referred to as outstanding, 20 and 40 years after they had passed away.

CHAPTER 16 NOTES

1. Based on reports in Atchison newspapers at the time of her death.
2. From family papers loaned by Mr. John H. Mize of Atchison. Mr. Mize read a draft of this portion of the story.
3. From an item in an Atchison newspaper dated October 5, 1916. Collection of John H. Mize.
4. From a newspaper report of the wedding.
5. Information supplied by Mrs. Mize.
6. Reports in the Atchison newspapers, December 1936.
7. From the *Atchison Daily Globe,* Tuesday, January 7, 1938. Abigail's death was reported in the edition of Feb. 28, 1958. The story of Helene's funeral mentioned Cyrus' role in connection with the Scofield Reference Bible. The items were made available with the assistance of Margaret Schwein of the Globe.

CHAPTER 17

Pastor and Benedict

> *"There be three things which are too wonderful for me, yea four which I know not: . . . ; and the way of a man with a maid."*
> Proverbs 30:18,19

In the Evangelical tradition, it is usually assumed that the recommendation of a man for a vacant pastorage is based on careful evaluation of the life, character and belief of the candidate. The recommendation of Cyrus Scofield for the vacant Pastorate of the First Congregational Church of Dallas, Texas, cannot possibly have been made on such a basis.

When the word of the vacant pulpit in Dallas got around, Cyrus had, according to his own story, been converted less than three years. He admitted to almost total ignorance of the Scriptures at the reputed time of conversion.[1] He completely lacked any Christian or theological training and his formal schooling appears to have been very limited. The only intellectual attainment was his admission to the Bar of the State of Kansas, a privilege which he abused to the full.

Counseling was not in the 1880's the "in" thing in the church that it is today. But his family status, if honestly related, should have raised serious doubts about his fitness for a pastoral role.

He was later reported to have been:

> . . . a wonderful preacher and a world preacher. He would have been at ease in any congregation where he could have preached. Thoughtful people call him a great preacher. There was about his a positiveness, a definitiveness, a certainty. . . .[2]

More prosaicly this could be called a gift of gab which can carry any public figure a long way. It appears that he had a mind which could quickly pick up and expound teaching of a sort which would have delighted J. N. Darby.

In the light of the facts about the man, the recommendation of Scofield clearly ignores the standards set by the Apostle Paul as he wrote to both Timothy and Titus. The actions of Brookes and Goodell are a bit inexplicable. They proposed a man separated from but still legally married to a wife of another faith. And to that family, Scofield was making little contribution in the way of support. Possibly they were unaware of the family, or possibly the three (Brookes, Goodell and Scofield) may have considered Scofield's past so covered by the

blood of Christ that he could forget Leontine and the girls. (As we shall see later, Scofield *never* put them out of his life.)

The kindest position to take (and it may be quite inaccurate) is that Scofield covered his immediate past, possibly never once using the word "bachelor" but giving an impression of marital availability. Unfortunately, to be so kind reflects on the discernment of Brookes and Goodell. It has been noted that Oswald Allis, writing in 1945, unaware of Leontine, seemed convinced that Brookes was involved in a coverup of ideas. Maybe there was more cover-up or just who was pushing Scofield?[3]

The Church in Dallas issued a call which Scofield accepted. On Saturday, August 19, 1882, C. I. Scofield arrived in Dallas to begin his ministry. In 1882, the streets of Dallas were still largely unpaved. This meant alternation between seas of mud and clouds of dust. Except for the determination of the people, there was no indication of the great future of the city and no hint of its eventually becoming the home of Neiman-Marcus and of W. A. Criswell.

The First Congregational Church was a struggling work, smarting from a justifiable Texas distaste for anything "Yankee." The Congregational denomination had taken a significant part in the effort to end slavery. While the North seemed unaware of problems resulting from the War, the South was still feeling its hurt.

In 1876, the Congregationalists in Dallas had organized into a "Society" under Rev. Henry M. Daniels, sent to the city by the American Home Missionary Society, an agency of the denomination. The group incorporated as the First Congregational Church on January 7, 1877. With 17 charter members, First Church felt prepared to minister to a city of 10,000.

Eleven of the 17 charter members were from the North, adding to the social barriers hindering the acceptance of the church. Its first meeting place was in Crowdus Hall at Main and Austin in downtown Dallas. During its first four years, the group met in 15 different locations before finding a permanent home.

Germane to the story of Scofield, early in 1882, the pastor, Rev. W. C. McCue, was sent by the Denominational Society to Fort Worth. Word of the vacancy was noised about the denomination—reaching to St. Louis. (Things like that always manage to get around in religious circles.) Thus an opportunity was opened for Scofield and his dream of church failure.

On his first full day in town, August 20, 1882, Scofield conducted both morning and evening services. In the morning, his text was taken from Psalm 92:10. Basing his statement on Trumbull, BeVier flatly states that the congregation that day consisted of Deacon Page and 11 women.[4] However, careful reading of Trumbull indicates that the figure

referred to the membership list.[5] Trumbull noted that six husbands accompanied their wives.

At the evening service, Scofield preached on a most familiar text, John 3:18. As a result of the sermon, two conversions were reported. Trumbull notes that Scofield firmly committted to giving an invitation which required a specific act on the part of the listener who had been moved to respond to the message.[6]

Things went slowly at the start. Scofield himself was accepted socially in the community only after they found out that he had served for a time in the Confederate Army. But they just could not understand why he would preach in a "Yankee" church.

One Sunday, Scofield asked if any one would like to hold a "cottage prayer-meeting."[7] The only response was from a 12-year-old boy who was at the service without his parents. Scofield found out, much to his surprise, that the boy's father was a saloon keeper and that the home was above the gin-mill. On the appointed night, Scofield went to the home and found it entirely full of people invited by the boy. Before long that entire family was converted. Following this experience, Scofield made the cottage prayer-meeting an integral part of the church program.

When a new superintendent of the denomination visited Dallas six weeks later, he was delighted by the nine people who were received into the church. But the now unidentified superintendent cautioned Scofield in a manner which would have pleased his superiors who were based near Beacon Hill. He advised Scofield not to let the church become a "hoi polloi" affair.[8] As Trumbull tells of the incident (via Scofield) it appears that the superintendent may have been too much conditioned by his Bostonian base. But, as will be noted in a later chapter, some of the Dallas congregation whose circumstances were modest in 1882, climbed in social position as Dallas grew. Thus the superintendent's advice may have prevailed but in a way he did not expect.

Scofield's temporary arrangement with the church was regularized on October 22, 1882, with a call as pastor of the Congregational Church in Dallas for a term of one year, back-dated to August 11, 1882. On the same day, those nine new members were received into the church. One of them was the superintendent of missions for the Southwest for The American Home Missionary Society. And also on that same day a new building for the church, at the corner of Bryan and Harwood Streets was dedicated.[9]

In June 1883, The First Congregational Church, in a business meeting, voted Scofield a salary of $1,500 per year. In preparation for accepting the call, Scofield in September added his name to the rolls of First Church by a letter transferring him from the Pilgrim Congregational Church in St. Louis.[10]

Scofield had located at 611 Ross Avenue and from the study in that residence, on October 11, 1883, sent a written acceptance of the

call.[11] Thus was the way paved for the formal, organizational steps to Scofield's ordination to the Gospel ministry. We have noted that Scofield's ordination which took place that month was unusual in one respect. It was conducted while he was a defendant in a divorce proceeding.

Since ordination was then generally considered to be a formal, public declaration of a calling already made, ostensibly with primary motivation from God Himself, rigid professional and educational standards were generally not required as they are today. This was especially true in loosely organized bodies like the Congregational Church as it functioned in the United States. But with Scofield we are faced with the fact that he not only lacked formal training, but also he had been but a short time in the Christian life.

Dr. Arnold Ehlert, writing while at Dallas Seminary, said that Scofield was ordained "... after a course of study lasting 18 months, in which he went through three standard treatises on theology and numerous other works."[12] Now back-dating 18 months from the Ordination Day puts us in April 1882. Scofield was then involved in quashing, without reconciliation, Atchison County divorce case No. 2161. The state of mind suggested by his position in the case (and as related by *The Atchison Patriot* reporter) was hardly conducive to a real understanding of the deeper matters of the Word. (He must have been doing some studying to turn out two or three messages a week to serve his congregations, first in St. Louis, then in Dallas.)

In describing Scofield's arrival in Dallas on August 19, 1882, Trumbull implies that Scofield came with little more than a carpetbag.[13] (Of course he could have gone over to the express office during the week and picked up a trunk and a box of books.) The Scofield library no doubt grew after 1882. The new volumes came with regularity and all were called on in preparing sermons.

Looking again at Ehlert's statements, if Scofield began "cramming" for ordination as early as April 1882, either Goodell with Brookes' assistance was doing a "snow job" among Congregationalists or else someone not identified in material so far discovered had already designated Scofield for a minsterial role as a step to something else.

The whole Dispensational-Millenarian story is full of unexplained events and influences. As Ernest Sandeen says:

> ... But when everything has been said about the imperceptible and silent influence of Brethren teaching, when full account of energies and skills of all the Brethren teachers and writers has been taken, something still seems to be lacking.[14]

A similar lack of knowledge is apparent in the matter of the Scofield ordination and his entire clerical career.

As we noted in Chapter 15, Leontine had filed the second divorce plea in Kansas on October 1, 1883. As in the first case, Cyrus had

responded with a complete denial; purely a legal tactic. If the *Atchison Patriot* story is correct, Scofield probably welcomed the suit. Action by Leontine in another state would free him of an encumbrance in a manner which would not impair the image he was trying to create in Congregational circles. Among the unexplained points, there is a nagging suspicion that while officially without family ties, he was very well aware of what was going on in Atchison and timed his moves accordingly.

The Ordination Council for Cyrus Ingerson Scofield was part of the First Meeting of the North Texas Congregational Association held at First Church, Dallas, on Wednesday and Thursday, October 17 and 18, 1883.[15] Ehlert says that the ordination was conducted by ". . . a large committee of Congregational Ministers . . ."[16] Apparently Ehlert never read the minutes of First Church, nor saw a copy of the printed program.[17] In the church minutes, it is recorded that the Council was made up of representatives from the five Congregational churches then in the North Texas area and one from the Congregational Church at Caddo, Indian Territory. Such council was not large by either usual or Texas standards.

While apparently not noted in the minutes, the printed program lists as participants a Rev. Robert West of Chicago and Rev. C. L. Goodell of St. Louis, Mo. As noted earlier, Goodell must have been aware of the *Atchison Patriot* story and the other misadventures of Scofield.

On Wednesday morning between 10 a.m. and 12 noon, Scofield met with the Council and was examined as to his fitness for the Gospel ministry. The Minute Book of the church notes that during the examination Scofield related his "Christian experiences" and read a statement of his doctrinal views. The statement is reproduced in full and discussed in the next chapter.

On May 30, 1926, five years after Scofield's death, *The Daily Times Herald* of Dallas carried a story about Scofield which referred to the events of October 17, 1883.[18] The article said that the Presbytery (this at once makes us suspicious) was told of Scofield's whole past life. The impression is that the council assumed that his past was covered by the Blood of Christ.

Unless the secretary had his "tongue in cheek" in recording the council session, we feel that the newspaper story includes some "embellishment." Now even in the 1880's, Texas did not hold to the bluestocking views attributed to New England. But we must feel that had the ministers, other than Goodell, making up the council heard about Vollmer's buggy ride or been apprised of the utter neglect of Leontine and the girls, the ordination would not have gone through. "The Christian experiences" related according to the minutes, were as genuine as a Confederate three-dollar bill. Scofield and Goodell had some secrets which they shared among themselves and kept from the council.

The Ordination and Installation Exercises started at 7:30 p.m. that evening. The Ordination Sermon was preached by Goodell. The Benediction was pronounced by the newly ordained Rev. C. I. Scofield.

Next afternoon, the new ordinate joined with Goodell in a discussion, "Shall we seek largely through Revivals the upbuilding and increase of our Churches?" The Session concluded with a social gathering at 7:30 p.m. and a closing address (subject not given) by Rev. C. I. Scofield.

A family from Ypsilanti, Michigan, referred to variously as Wark or Van Wark, moved to Dallas late in 1883. Two daughters, Hettie and her sister, started attending First Church and joined in December 1883.

In January 1884 Scofield submitted his first annual report as pastor. He noted that the membership had reached a count of 75 (including Hettie Van Wark). The Sunday School was weak and Scofield criticized a "dangerous deficiency" in interest in missions.[18]

Scofield, feeling free from Leontine, began paying attention to Hettie Van Wark. The relationship moved quite rapidly from friendship to courtship to marriage. Here again we find discrepancy piled upon discrepancy. The Marriage Certificate, on file with properly constituted authorities, is dated March 11, 1884. But in "Who's Who in America," Scofield gave the wedding date as July 14, 1884.[19] Now the tendency of American husbands to forget anniversary dates is legendary, but we submit that the conflict in this case is not due to mere forgetfulness.

It was reported by Trumbull and others that Cyrus and Hettie were married after a friendship of about six months.[20] Now backdating six months from March 1884, takes us to September 1883. Cyrus was then still legally bound to Leontine and not morally free to court Hettie or anyone else. Based on the date the Wark (or Van Wark) sisters joined First Church, we cannot be sure that they were in Dallas six months prior to the date shown on the marriage certificate. The July date may have been circulated to give an impression that the courtship did not begin until the decree of divorce became final in December 1883.

CHAPTER 17 NOTES

1. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 26. Trumbull says of Scofield's Sunday School experience: ". . . and he learned a little there."
2. Statement of George W. Truett at the Memorial service for Scofield November 27, 1921, reported in *The Dallas Morning News,* November 28, 1921.
3. "Prophecy and The Church" by Oswald Allis, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1948, p. 13. Allis in turn refers to H. A. Ironside, "The *Brethren Movement,*" p. 196.
4. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 37.
5. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 41.
6. Trumbull, *ibid.* For a comment on"The Invitation System," see pamphlet by Iain Murray issued by The Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburg, Scotland and Carlisle, Pa. Scofield's pattern has been typical of the movement which grew out of his teaching,

but has never been accepted in some branches of the Protestant Church, including those of the Reformed tradition.

7. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 45.
8. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 46.
9. Record Book, First Congregational Church, Mss., p. 11.
10. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 40.
11. Church Records, First Congregational Church, Dallas, Mss., p. 21-24.
12. Arnold Ehlert, A *Bibliographic History of Dispensationalism,* Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, 1965, p. 83. Ehlert in turn bases his statement on Trumbull, p. 43.
13. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 41.
14. Ernest R. Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism, British and American Millenarianism* 1800-1830, University of Chicago Press, 1970, p. 80.
15. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 40, based on records of First Church.
16. Ehlert, *op. cit.*, p. 83, again based on Trumbull, p. 43.
17. The Printed Program is preserved in the Collection of the Philadelphia College of The Bible, Langhonre, Pa.
18. *The Daily Times Herald,* May 30, 1926, p. 1 of Section 6. Note that the items considered in the newspaper story are not those of a sort considered by a reporter, but suggest material released by someone interested in the Scofield image. We will note that one of the Dallas papers was owned by a family in the Scofield Church. The improbability of Scofield making revelations of the sort implied in the newspaper is heightened by noting that 25 years after the ordination, when Scofield was working on the "Bible," he was still sensitive enough about his pre-1883 omissions that he avoided comment on verses in both Testaments which dealt with such matters. He could not have been less sensitive in 1883.
19. Church Records, Mss. p. 32.
20. "Who's Who in America, 1912."
21. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

CHAPTER 18

The Doctrinal Statement of a Minister

"Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partaker of other men's sins,; keep thyself pure."

I Tim. 5:22

At his ordination examination, October 17, 1883, Cyrus I. Scofield presented the following doctrinal statement. The original is preserved as pages 25-29 of the Record Book, First Congregational Church, Dallas, Texas (now known as the Scofield Memorial Church). The statement is:

Jesus of Nazareth is the centre and source of my theology. Presented to me in the four Gospels (narratives which reason and research alike tell me could not have been invented) as a supernatural Being—God manifested in the flesh (I Tim. 3:16, John 1:14). I find in history, and in my own experience, results wrought by Him which fully vindicate His claims. I therefore believe in Him.

I believe in the divine origin and authority of the Old Testament Scriptures because I find in them such a record as Jesus promised, by the Spirit (John 16: 12–13). Those are the sufficient reasons, though there are others, weighty and convincing, why I believe that the Bible, as we have it, is the Word of God, a revelation from and of Him, infallible, and absolutely binding upon the conscience and conduct of men.

Taking, then, the Holy Scriptures, authenticated by Jesus, as final and conclusive authority, I find God revealed as a Spirit, (John 4:24), eternally existing, (1 Tim. 1:17) as Father, Son and Holy Ghost.

Jesus Christ is the son of Man and the Son of God: the Eternal Word. (John 1:1) manifest in the flesh, perfect man and perfect God. I believe this without understanding the mystery of two natures constituting but one Personality, nor am I able to explain it by analogical illustration.

The Holy Spirit is revealed as the Creative Agent in regeneration, (John 3:6–8), as baptising the believer into the one body of Christ; as sealing him unto the day of his redemption; as his abiding and indwelling Comforter and Sanctifier (John 14:16-17), and as his Power for service, (Acts 1:8).

The Scriptures, and Jesus Christ, reveal God as a Being infinitely compassionate, long-suffering, tender and forebearing, and He is defined to *be* Love; but revelation also presents Him as a Law-Giver—as the Lord God omnipotent who reigneth, and who has supreme and inescapable claims upon the obedience of His creature, man.

The Scriptures declare that all men have voluntarily transgressed that law, and therefore, describe the race as "lost," (Luke 19:20); as "dead in trespasses and sins," and "by nature the children of wrath," (Eph. 2:1-2); as having a mind which is "emnity against God" (Ro. 8:7); and a heart

"deceitful about all things and desperately wicked." (Jer. 17:9) As to practices it is said that "there is no difference for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God," and that "there is none righteous, no, not one." I receive this arraignment as true, upon the testimony of Scripture, but I find it amply confirmed by Self-knowledge, and by a wide observation.

The Scriptures teach that all the benefits secured for the race by the expiatory death of Christ are received by the individual only through faith in Him. By believing on the Lord Jesus Christ I do not understand merely the acceptance of a scheme of salvation, or theory of the Atonement, however scriptural they may be, but a hearty faith in Jesus Himself as the personal saviour of the believer.

I hold that such faith is always accompanied by that sincere repentence which involves a change of mind toward God, and in respect of the guilt of sin.

As the results of such belief in Jesus Christ, the Scriptures assure the believer that he is completely justified, has peace with God and a standing in His favor; (Acts 13:39, Ro. 5: 1) becomes through regeneration His child; (John 1: 12–13; Gal. 3:26), and so a partaker of the Divine Nature, (2 Ret. *(sic)* 1:4), and a recipient of the gift of eternal life, with the assurance that he shall never perish. (John 3:14-16; John 5:24; John 10:27–29).

But the Scriptures, while strenuously insisting upon the utter inefficienty of good works to salvation, are equally strenuous in the assertion that good works are inseparable *from* it. The man thus saved will live a changed life. It is true that "that which is born of the flesh, is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit;" (John 3:6) and that "the flesh lusteth against the spirit and the Spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other, so that ye cannot do the things that ye would," (Gal. 5:17) and it may be conceded that entire sanctification is unattainable in this life, yet it remains Scripturally true that the fruits of the Spirit will result from the possession of the Spirit—that a righteous character will be the sure outcome of the righteous nature; and that the stern *dictum* of James:—"Wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead," (Jas. 2:29) should be insisted on most of all by the man who preaches that salvation is "not of works lest any man should boast." (Eph. 2:9).

I believe that such sincere believers constitute the "Church which is the body of Christ;" and that such, and only such, should be gathered into a visible church composed of self-governing local assemblies.

I believe that the Word should be ministered in such assemblies only by regenerate persons who manifestly have been endued with one or more of the spiritual gifts of Prophet, Evangelist, Pastor or Teacher, and that it is proper that one such person should be set apart by each assembly to minister the Word, but I do not believe he should be intrusted with any priestly authority.

In view of such plain and nonfigurative Scriptures as Matthew 24:37–41; Luke 18:8; 2 Thess. 23:1–11; 2 Tim. 1:15; 2 Tim. 2:19–21; 2 Tim. :1–8; 2 Tim. 4:3; Titus 1:10, 11; 1 Pet. 4:17–18; 2 Pet. 2:1–12; 2 Pet. (entire 3rd chap.); 1 John 2:18; 1 John 4:1–3; Jude 17, 18, 19; and the Parables of the Tares and Net in Matt. 13, I am unable to believe that the world will be converted to Christ before His second coming; and I do

believe that His second coming will be personal, (Acts 1:11) and pre-millennial.

Those who are familiar with the eschatology of the Pre-Millennial Second Advent know that it excludes the possibility of future probations, in which, therefore, I do not believe.

I believe in Eternal Life as the present and future possession of the believer in Jesus Christ, and in everlasting punishment as the fate of those who end this life in unbelief.

The Rev. Geoffrey Thomas, pastor of the Alfred Place Baptist Church, Aberystwyth, Wales, at the request of this writer made a number of interesting comments on the Scofield Doctrinal Statement. When Rev. Mr. Thomas made his comments, he had only the test of the confession, the maker not being identified.

Several things in the statement were found objectionable. Note that Thomas writes from the viewpoint of the Reformed Faith which has never accepted the premises of Dispensational interpretation. Since points questioned by Thomas are integral to the fabric of Scofield's later thought, it might behove the Chiliastic constituency to consider whether or not there is an essential lack of orthodoxy in Dispensationalism.

Thomas comments:

> The personal statement of faith you sent me is interesting reading. In many ways it is typical of the decline in confessions of faith of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Instead of the full great confessions like the Westminster, Savoy or Philadelphia being taken, men made their own brief statements of gospel fundamentals embracing a wide spectrum of evangelicals, *e.g.* containing not a reference to the ordinance of baptism, but obviously independent of church government, and pre-mill—as if this were synonymous with evangelicalism/orthodoxy.
>
> The weakness of minimal creeds displays itself in any local church situation where there are folk convinced of both the Arminiam *and* Calvinistic systems of theology, or of both paedo- and believers' baptism. Then such a creed could not hold the two groups together and would be an insufficient court of appeal (in matters like the invitation system in evangelism which would be anathema to a Calvinist—pleading for men to do what God is powerless to do and to show it by a physical act. The whole atmosphere of piety and reverence accompanies a church committed to the whole counsel of God.) Statements of faith such as these are inadequate for the purposes of evangelism and worship, and discipline. . . . (I)t lacks the whole 4th dimension of an awareness of the past and its importance in forming and structuring our worship and convictions until today. The break in historical continuity is serious: Rome capitalises so much about this.[1]

It is to a great extent that lack of historical continuity which impelled this writer into the present study. To find that concern shared by another is gratifying. But to realize that the historical lack is so inherent in the Dispensational scheme that it can be recognized even when a doc-

ument is not labeled, suggests that in the work of Scofield there are serious doctrinal problems.

The loss of historical sense helps to downgrade the uniqueness of the Bible. The loss of value causes the adherent to lose a base for sensible valuing of our present dilemma and the ability to provide Biblically based solutions to the serious social and political problems of the day.

Thomas is quite specific about certain statements which he considers objectionable in the light of Historic Christian faith:

> 1) that he absolutises the person and work of *one* of the members of the Godhead. It is important to remember the great confession of the OT that God is *one* God. We are not Jesus worshippers; we are Trinitarian. Start with God.
>
> 2) His confidence in the 4 Gospels (again, not the starting place of the Holy Bible) is based upon reason and research, rather than upon their own self-attestation to their own infallibility. They do not need another authority like "reason and research' to confirm that they are true. Another man might say—as thousands have said—that reason and research persuade them that the 4 Gospels are *not* true.
>
> 3) Similarly his commitment to Christ is based upon his observations of the results of Christ's working in history and his own experience. This is not so; it is based upon the Holy Spirit working conviction and pointing to Christ in his own life.
>
> 4) We believe the Scriptures ultimately because of their testimony to their own veracity. God is the only sufficient witness to himself.
>
> 5) The reference to the benefits the "race" receives from the death of Christ needs clarification. If the human race benefits, why are these benefits not shown? That is, if Christ did something for the whole of humanity on the cross where is the evidence in the life of humanity? You must either limit the purpose of the death of Christ to some and say how they indicate these benefits in their lives, or you must say He did something for everybody which was much milder and weaker and failed to apply it to them.
>
> 6) Lastly, he makes regeneration follow after a man believing, as one of the *benefits* of personal faith and constituting *adoption,* rather than regeneration being the very necessary means to a stony heart believing on Christ. *(i.e.* regeneration is the means to faith, not the result of faith.)

The comments of Geoffrey Thomas are more than a bit devastating to the validity of the beliefs of the man on whom hands were laid in Dallas on that October day in 1883. But as he was making his comments, Thomas had no idea of the life of the man who offered the statement as evidence of his fitness for a pastoral role.

Some additional comments are in order, based on knowledge of man and deed. The statement: ". . . supreme and inescapable claims upon the obedience of His creature, man," raises questions—and even eyebrows. The narrative of the deeds of the period suggests that our

subject either had very flexible definitions of obedience or offered the statements with his tongue as far in his cheek as he could push it.

He says: "I hold that such faith is always accompanied by that sincere repentance which involves a change of mind toward God, and in respect of the guilt of sin." It has been noted that the repentance of Cyrus Scofield never included restitution to Simpson, McLean, Vollmer and probably not the Kansas Republicans. And certainly the neglect of Leontine was never made up. A quarter of a century later, we will find certain omissions from his great opus which might well indicate that he had not resolved the problem of his own guilt.

In the days of World War I, he referred thus to David: "Here are the last words of David, the sweet Psalmist of Israel; his life stained with many sins, yet a man who loved God supremely."[2] Is it possible that he thus wrote because he even then could not claim the release of the 51st Psalm as his own experience?

Scofield very firmly sets out his beliefs in the area of eschatology in his statement. The very positiveness is remarkable for a man who a few short years before was living by forgery and who by his own admission was almost illiterate spiritually. His definite statement "plain and nonfigurative Scripture" confirms his commitment to the ideas of J. N. Darby. But in four short years of the Christian life Scofield probably had not had an opportunity to be exposed to or consider any other system of interpretation.

The sixteen Scripture passages he lists to be taken literally to the exclusion of all else may or may not support Scofield's position. The view that he supports gives redeemed man no hope of victory over the forces of evil short of heaven. It calls for total victory for evil, with redeemed humanity rescued from failure only by a personal intervention by Christ. Man just goes along for the ride.

Scofield's citation of Acts 1:11 overlooks the fact that the statement of the Angel (all believers would see Him as He returns) conflicts with the firm Dispensational belief in a "secret Rapture." Then no one is supposed to see Him until they get "into the clouds" leaving their autos behind them. Or so Scofield and successors interpret I Thes. 4:16, 17.

The Parable of the Wheat and the Tares *(Matthew 13)* which Scofield cites says quite plainly that the Lord will have the wicked (tares) removed first at the end. Scofield *(SRB, p. 1629)* has the believers (wheat) taken out first. Who is right, Jesus or Scofield?

Similar analysis is possible for other verses cited in the statement.

The Doctrinal Statement might pass if one accepted to the full the failing church syndrome—and if the statement were really sincerely offered.[3] The presence of Atchison County divorce case No. 2681 on the court's current docket in Kansas makes any reasonable person have serious questions on the matter of his sincerity.

The succeeding chapters will show the sort of ministry which followed the Statement. There will be hints of how the objectives of the "Failing Church Syndrome" were obtained.

But is that really what Jesus meant when He said "The Gates of Hell shall not prevail against the Church!" Who really wrote the Statement?

CHAPTER 18 NOTES

1. Letter to the writer dated 16 September 1976. Mr. Thomas' consent was obtained at the time that the writer advised Mr. Thomas that the Statement he commented on was that of C. I. Scofield.
2. "Addresses on Prophecy" by C. I. Scofield, A. C. Gaebelein, New York Publisher, 1910, p. 75.
3. The idea of social failure for the church has continued. Note the statement of Carl F. H. Henry at the end of 1977: "Another year has passed in which the movement has registered no notable influences on the formative ideas and ideals of American culture." The statement, made in TIME, December 27, 1977, p. 77 has been followed in succeeding years by similar statements. Henry is part of the movement built on the foundation that Scofield laid. Henry remarkably seems agreeable to the failure noted and its promotion by Hal Lindsey. He further seems amenable to a "Post Christian" era for which we can find no Biblical basis. R. J. Rushdoony explains why the church is responsible for its own weakness: "In the modern era, the church, while numerically strong, has grown less and less influential and more and more peripheral to everyday life, to politics, economics, the arts and sciences, and all else. For most people, the church is irrelevant to the "real world" of human affairs. It provides a limited moral training for children, a social focus for the family, and not much more. Churches have numbers, not strength. Both in membership and in leadership, the churches are radically weak. *(Journal of Christian Reconstruction, Vol. IV,* No. 1, *p.* 96). Rushdoony has pointed out that the church consistently fails when it loses it vision of victory over sin and evil in social and cultural settings as well as in the context of personal salvation.

CHAPTER 19

A Growing Ministry

"Preach the Word, Be instant in season and out of season."
II Tim. 4:2a

It is interesting to note progress in church life in the First Congregational Church of Dallas, even in the face of questionable items in the life of Scofield, the minister. Possibly in a society under pressure from the ideas of men as diverse as Voltaire, Marx, Darwin and Darby, no other channels for the Gospel were readily available. As Neatby, historian of the Plymouth Brethren, has said:

> I am far from denying that God many bestow a measure of His blessing where there is a great deal of confusion. If he did not, I fear there would be no blessing at all for the Church on earth. But I deny that His favours are so indiscriminately bestowed as to constitute no criterion whatever of His approval.[1]

With Leontine "forgotten," at least officially, and Hettie installed in the parsonage, Scofield had numerical success in his church. But how could that membership have grown to full Christian maturity on a diet of chopped-up Bible and "any-moment Rapture"?

The church had been regarded, quite justly, as Yankee and that in the most derogatory sense of that term. After all, the Congregational denomination had helped to split the country apart in achieving its goal of abolition. While Scofield's own congregation never conformed to the denominational norm, outsiders could hardly be blamed for failing to note fine distinctions in sectarian beliefs.

Dr. James M. Gray, president of Moody Bible Institute, related a story in this connection at the Testimonial Dinner for Scofield held in New York on October 26, 1916. Gray noted that the story had come to him second hand:

> His church was regarded as a northern church, for which reason, as all of the wounds of the Civil War were not yet healed, he was not very cordially received by the citizens at large. Yet he never alluded to the fact that he had fought with Lee in the Confederate Army. But one day, an out-of-town Editor met him on the street, one who had been his companion in arms, and who straightway published an account of meeting with him. He told of the battles in which Scofield and he had fought side by side, and ate or starved together as the days came and went. Lo, what a change was wrought in Dallas so far as the esteem of Dr. Scofield was concerned.[2]

It is, of course, well that Scofield had made no allusion to fighting with Lee. Military records show that Scofield, throughout his recorded military service, would have had no direct contact with Lee and often was as far from him as Abraham Lincoln was. But we do wish that Gray and the unidentified editor-friend had been more specific. "Editor" and his military record might just have been a channel through which we could solve some of the mystery referred to in Chapter 6. A horrible thought! What would have happened if the out-of-town editor had been from Atchison, Kansas, where Scofield's reputation has remained unsavoury over a century?

Speculation aside, the now-unidentified editor did a service to Scofield and his growing ministry. As mentioned in Chapter 7, the Yankee stigma was gradually obliterated. The church became quite acceptable in a southern community. And editor-companion-at-arms may have helped Scofield see new potential in his one year of military service.

In 1886, D. L. Moody, accompanied by Ira D. Sankey, conducted meetings in Dallas, March 5 through March 7. The services were held in the local skating rink. One report indicated that the building was packed with up to 4,000 people.[3]

After nearly four years of Scofield's pastorate, on May 1, 1886, the First Congregational Church of Dallas assumed its own support. In severing its ties as a mission project, the church expressed "heartfelt thanks" to The American Home Missionary Society for its years of support.[4] At that time, the Scofields, Cyrus and Hettie, lived at 1126 Jackson Street, between Ervay and South Harwood Streets.[5]

Early in the fall of 1886, The American Home Missionary Society offered Scofield the position of superintendent for the states of Louisiana and Texas.[6] The congregation learned of the negotiations in October and adopted a resolution asking their pastor not to accept the offer. For nearly a quarter of a century, the people of First Church were determined to hold Scofield as pastor; he was equally determined to serve wider fields, giving the congregation that part of his time which did not interfere with other opportunities. The Dallas post provided a base income which was reasonably steady.

It appears that Scofield conducted the negotiations with little or no consultation with the Church. In his annual report, made in November 1886, Scofield noted that he would continue to serve the Dallas church but would be acting missionary superintendent until the Society could appoint another man. During that period the Society agreed to pay part of Scofield's salary.[7] That other man was not appointed until Scofield left Dallas nine years later. The activities as superintendent will be related in the next chapter.

The annual report included a note by Scofield, thanking the congregation for the "unusually long vacation" granted him that year. He

went on to say that he expected to be absent from Dallas, from the beginning of July 1887 until the end of October ministering in Bible conferences elsewhere.[8]

Scofield maintained a teaching ministry in Dallas that reached out beyond the parish of First Church. He conducted a weekly class at the YMCA, and he led training classes for young men who showed evidence of pastoral and evangelistic gifts. Of the men who participated in those classes, only 10 reportedly finished the course.[9] The 10 were ordained to the ministry after suitable examination and with appropriate ordination ceremonies.

By the beginning of 1888, with 250 new members, all no doubt waiting for the "any-moment Rapture," it became necessary for the Church to make a decision on the matter of a new and larger building. After much discussion and some reversals of earlier decisions, the congregation at a meeting in October, decided to erect a new building on the site already in use at the corner of Bryan and Harwood Streets. Before making that commitment, they had been able to enlarge the property by purchase of adjoining plots. Construction of the new church took place during 1889. The building stood until 1950.[10]

In this period, something of a mystery develops concerning Scofield's personal life. The Dallas City Directory for 1888-1889 shows Scofield residing in rented rooms Mrs. Gillie Cockrell at 301 Pearl Street, corner Cottage Lane.[11] (Gillie sounds almost as though she came out of some British novel, say H. G. Wells' "Mr. Polly.") Hettie, during nine months of 1888, was pregnant. Rented rooms are not the most desirable place for a pregnant mother to reside, especially if her husband is traveling to promote any-moment end of the age.

The pregnancy ended December 22, 1888, with the birth of a son named Noel Paul. But available records indicate that Noel's birth occurred in Michigan, not Dallas.[12] The explanation eludes—but notice must be taken of the fact that in 1888, Abigail became 21 and her relationship with her father came out from under the ban of the District Court in Atchison. Hettie had then to cope with a situation for which few wives, especially wives of ministers, were prepared in Victorian years.

In the office of the county clerk of Dallas County, there is a document dated October 1, 1889, by which Thomas J. Jones, a bachelor, transferred to Cyrus I. Scofield, the property at 157 Holmes Avenue, Dallas, including the residence erected and standing thereon. Scofield is recorded as paying for the property with $731.25 in cash and five notes, amounts and due dates as follows:

No. 1	$2400.00	Due on or before October 1, 1894.
2	412.60	Due on or before April 10, 1890.
3	400.00	Due on or before April 10, 1891.

4	300.00	Due on or before November 10,1892.
5	256.15	Due on or before November 15, 1893.

The last four notes were listed as drawing interest at 10 percent payabale semi-annually. (Six percent was the maximum interest legally permitted under the Texas Constitution by an Amendment of 1891, unless a higher rate not exceeding 10 percent was agreed to by the parties.) Jones was a member of the church and scion of one of its leading families. By the time the compilers closed the entries for the Dallas City Directory, 1890 Edition, Cyrus, Hettie and Noel were in residence.[13]

While real estate matters were occupying a large place on Scofield's mind and taking up some of his time, an event occurred in St. Louis which should be noted. The *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* October 27, 1889, carried the following obituary:

> Papin, Emiline E., wife of the late Sylvester V. Papin at Webster Groves, October 25, 1889. Funeral Sunday the 27th inst. at 2 o'clock p.m. from St. John's Episcopal Church, corner of Hickory and Dolman Streets. Relatives of S. V. Papin will please meet at the residence of John G. Prather, Esq., 1411 Chouteau Avenue.[14]

Omission of the maiden name made it difficult for anyone in the Dispensational community to connect Emeline with a noted Bible teacher. Emeline's will filed for probate in St. Louis County (county offices are now in Clayton, Missouri), provided that the bulk of her estate was to be invested. The interest thus earned was to be paid out equally to her surviving brother and sisters. As already noted, the bequest to Cyrus was modified to provide that Cyrus' share was to be divided between Cyrus and Leontine if the two were not living together. In view of the divorce decree in 1883, Cyrus and Leontine both began receiving payments amounting to one-sixth of the income from Emeline's estate. Cyrus' portion was a pleasant supplement to the Conference Love Offerings.

By this time, Scofield's ideas, divided Dispensationally, had assumed the shape there were to manifest in the Scofield Reference Bible, But essentially the theology had to be eclectic. Except for the missing months when he was shedding Leontine, there is no positive evidence, as with the Apostle Paul, of an Arabian period *(Galatians 1.:17, 18)* when he could have reflected, meditated and been filled with the Word. Scofield, according to the record, got right into service. He remained active until well past the three-score and ten terminal point.

Unfortunately, we have no details as to the volumes which made up his library. Nor have we seen reference to the disposition of the volumes from which he drew his ideas. The writings of Darby, Trotter, Kelly, Walter Scott (not the novelist, the other one) and CHM (Mackintosh) must have contributed something.[15] It has been suggested that Malachi Taylor of New York City has some influence.[16]

But we must note the possibility of an influence closer at hand—in the American Southwest. In 1883, a Southern Baptist minister, J. R. Graves, published: "*The Work of Christ Consummated in Seven Dispensations.*" Issued by the Baptist Sunday School Board of Texarkana, Ark.-Tex., it includes a preface signed by the author from "Arcadia near Memphis, Tenn." It features a dispensational scheme quite similar to one which was later used in the Scofield Reference Bible. For some strange reason, Graves is almost never mentioned by Dispensational writers who are not committed Baptists.[17] The appearance of Dispensational ideas, seemingly out-of-the-blue in Middle America in apparent isolation from the mainstream flowing from Albury and Powerscourt, is remarkable. Officially, Graves and William Miller of the Seventh-day Adventists are the only two thinkers along advent lines whose ideas apparently sprung from native soil. But as the movements are studied, that home-grown stance might prove to be more apparent than real.

Rev. Milburn Cockrell of Ashland, Ky., the leading exponent of Graves' teaching today, said in a letter to the writer:

> J. R. Graves is undoubtedly the most interesting man of his generation. Scholars handle him like a hot potato. It is true that dispensationalists tend to ignore him, but I am not sure why, unless it is because of his firm stand on the local church only.[18]

George W. Dollar, in his history of Fundamentalism, does refer to Graves. His comments confirm Cockrell's valuation—Graves held for the visible local church in contrast to Darby's "invisible church."[19] This places Graves outside the pale.

Since Graves' work had its primary circulation in the area Scofield was using as a base, the possibility of an unacknowledged debt to Graves must be considered. With Scofield's lack of formal training and a need to learn fast, no reasonable source of help would have been overlooked. Mention of some sources could have been intentionally forgotten.

As a result of Scofield's study, he broke into print in 1888. *Rightly Dividing the World of Truth* was an outgrowth of the study to teach his classes and give them tangible lesson help. It faithfully presented the Dispensational view. The final touches were put on his manuscript while he was in atmosphere of prophetic hope (and social despair) at the Niagara Bible Conference.[20] The booklet contained what Trumbull called the central doctrines "essential to any real comprehension of the message."[21] The first edition was printed by the Plymouth Brethren house, Loizeaux Brothers of New York. The study has appeared in a number of editions and has been on the lists of several houses. For example, Through the Bible Publishers, Dallas, Texas, printed 35,000 copies between 1945 and 1954.[22]

The booklet was so unfortunate and so unnecessary. Back in 1856, while Scofield was hunting raccoon in Lenawee County, Michigan, a kindly, Godly, Scot named Patrick Fairbairn, freed from years of entrapment in an early form of Dispensationalism, had written a Scripturally based refutation of the whole business.[23] In the light of Fairbairn's work, to name just one, the activity of Scofield should have been a case of "beating a dead horse." But Dispensationalists have been effective in covering up orthodox works of differing prophetic bias. They continue to "beat the dead horse," as the followers are unaware of the real status of prophetic knowledge and of other prophetic views.

CHAPTER 19 NOTES

1. Neatby, A *History of the Plymouth Brethren,* p. 337.
2. Testimonial to Rev. C. I. Scofield, D. D., Moody *Bible Institute Monthly,* Sept. 1921, p. 500ff. There must be some question about this story. Since local editors do not customarily open their pages to "visiting firemen," the way the story might have come was for a Dallas editor to pickup the story from a copy of the editor's paper which came across the exchange desk. We do not know whether at the time of the story, any Dallas newspaper owners were members of Scofield's church, as they were in the next decade. Without citation, the story related by Gray is difficult to trace.
3. D. Phillip Lindsley, *A History of Greater Dallas and Vicinity,* pp. 146-7.
4. Trumbull, *op. cit.,* p. 52.
5. Dallas City Directory 1886-1887, Dallas Public Library.
6. Record Book, First Congregational Church, mss. p. 39.
7. Record Book, First Congregational Church, p. 51.
8. *Ibid,* p. 51.
9. Trumbull, op. *cit.,* p. 52.
10. Record Book, First Congregational Church, pp. 54, 56, Church Register, mss. pp. 42-47.
11. Dallas City Directory, 1888, Dallas Public Library.
12. The clue of Noel's birthplace, which came after much fruitless search, was in his Death Certificate on file with the New York State Department of Health, Albany, N.Y. The birth is not confirmed by entry in the State of Michigan Health Records.
13. Dallas City Directory, 1890 Edition.
14. Newspaper item supplied by the St. Louis Public Library.
15. Kraus, *Dispensationalism in America,* John Knox, 1958, p. 113.
16. Philip Mauro, *The Gospel of the Kingdom,* p. 20.
17. See Jesse W. Hodges (Oklahoma City) *Christ's Kingdom and Coming* and George W. Dollar in *A History of Fundamentalism in America.*
18. Letter from Cockrell to the writer, September 13, 1976.
19. Dollar, *op. cit.,* p. 57.
20. BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 46.
21. Trumbull, *op. cit.,* p. 46.
22. BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 46, note 116.
23. Patrick Fairbairn, *The Interpretation of Prophecy.* Reprinted 1964 by The Bannar of Truth, Edinburgh, Scotland, and Carlisle, Pennsylvania.

CHAPTER 20

Peripatetic Pastor

> "... *unto whom I now send thee. To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God. ...*"
>
> Acts 26:17b, 18a

Scofield barely got First Church established on a self-supporting basis when he started to engage in ministries outside the church, outside the city, outside the state. The outside ministeries meant that he had to divide his time, even as his teaching divided the Word (Dispensationally, of course).

We have noted that he was able to get the church to agree to lengthy vacation periods which made those extended ministries possible. Yet the record suggests that the people of First Church wanted Scofield as their pastor and agreed to the lengthy leaves as an alternative to losing him entirely. The attachment of the Dallas congregation for C. I. Scofield continued unabated until it merged into the respect for him generated after 1909 by the spread of the Scofield Reference Bible.

As the story continues, it will be noted that Scofield treated his later pastorates in the same manner as he treated First Church. He was always ready to accept speaking engagements elsewhere, leaving to local talent or itinerent visitors the job of filling the gap created by his absence.

Scofield's request for long vacation time was supported by the claim that he had a role in the growing Bible Conference movement. He was primarily concerned with the Prophetic Bible Conference which were to reshape a significant part of American Protestantism. By this time Middle America was acquiring a level of sophistication which would make the traditional camp meeting of frontier days seem crude. As the interest in prophecy (we call it the "failing church syndrome") developed, conference grounds with simple refinements missing from camp meetings, began to play a role in religious life. Sensational messages were beginning to attract large crowds. Reproductions, as large as life, of the image of Daniel 2 (as imagined by a poster artist) were greeted with wide-open eyes and mouths of the audiences, and they responded with questions such as whether the Kaiser was the "Anti-Christ."

In such prophetic conferences, the emotional element was somewhat restrained, especially when compared with the camp meetings.

Groups gathered for prophetic confabs seemed to be more selective in their make-up. A sobering note was provided by the prophetic warhorse of "recovering neglected truths." The neglected truths were invented by Lacunza and Darby.

Like his "master," Darby, Scofield did not keep itineraries and schedules meticulously in his conference roles. One conference, which became the elite, the Oxford, the Canterbury, of the movement was the Niagara Bible Conference. This was so closely related to Scofield and his teaching that it receives seperate consideration in the next chapter.

But Scofield may have been farther afield that prophetic conferences in North America. In August 1903, he preached a sermon at Moody Church in Chicago. In that message, we find the following: "When I am in London I often go to that part of the city in which is situated the building called the "Horse Guards." It is the Headquarters of the British Army. . . ."[1] The reference suggests that before 1903 he had become quite familiar with London, even though getting there would have meant somewhat lengthy steamship crossings. Yet, no mention has been made by either Trumbull or BeVier of any European trips in the 19th Century. Both are quite specific in referring to the first European trip of the Scofields as "Mrs. Scofield's first trip."[2]

Scofield's European reputation did not develop until the Bible project got under way. So a trip to London before 1900 cannot be attributed to conference ministries. But there are times during his vacations from the Dallas pulpit when he could have gone to England.

We are reminded of the questions C. S. Lewis has his character Miss Hardcastle ask Jane Studdock in *"That Hideous Strength":*.

"And where had you been honey?"

"You hadn't been getting up to mischief while Hubby was away, had you?"

"Where had you been by that train?"[3]

We would ask Scofield:

"Where had you been on that ship?"

"Who paid for the trips?"

"Who did you see?"

Note in this connection that when Robert Scott, the Plymouth Brethren publisher, appears in the Scofield story in 1898 and later in 1904, he is introduced as someone new to Scofield as though not contacted on the trips that took Scofield to the Horse Guards.

Ernest Sandeen has commented:

> . . . but when everything has been said about the imperceptible and silent influence of Brethren teaching, when full account of the energies and skills of all the Brethren teachers and writers has been taken, something still seems to be lacking.[4]

An understanding of the 19th Century ocean crossings by Scofield might contribute something to filling in the lack which Sandeen noted.

In the previous chapter, we related Scofield's negotiations with the American Home Missionary Society, conducted originally without consulting the church. AHMS was an arm of the Congregational denomination, headquartered at Bible House, Astor Place, New York City: As a result of the negotiations with Scofield, he became their superintendent for Texas and Lousiana. That position along with the conference ministry was the basis for his request for the extended vacation periods which the church granted. But there must have been times when the superintendency required travel by Scofield outside the five-month period. So there must have been times when someone else had to fill the pulpit at First Church.

It is evident that Scofield conducted a considerable amount of the superintendent's task by correspondence. Some of Scofield's correspondence with Rev. Joseph M. Clark, secretary of the Society, has been preserved and is now at the Amisted Research Center, New Orleans, La.[5] From these letters we get another view of Scofield's ministries, along with glimpses of conditions under which church activities were conducted in the Southwest in the late 1880's and 1890's: The letters show that the jargon and lingo usually associated with Dispensationalism were never used in discussing matters with Rev. Clark.[6] Even when Scofield expressed concern about lack of funds, lack of workers or failure to meet the need of areas under his superintendence, no hint of Dispensational hope (hopelessness) can be found. The concern about lack of workers and failure to meet the challenge of advancing settlement which Scofield notes had been a burden of the churches even back in the days when the frontier had not yet crossed the Blue Ridge, and Darby had not yet invented Dispensationalism.

On April 2, 1889, Scofield wrote Clark regarding those waves of immigrants pouring into the Texas panhandle and into Southwestern Louisiana. (The letter is the first in the collection to be written on a typewriter:) Scofield noted that new communities faced the possibility of being "... left in absolute destitution of religious privileges, and that in the very stage of their development when those influences are most needed."[7] Noting that most of the settlers were from the North, Scofield felt that his group and its backers in the North had a large responsibility: While there was some growth of Congregationalism in the Southwest, the vision of Scofield for its expansion never materialized: Other denominations and some cults provided the major thrust in the area.

Both records of First Congregational Church, Dallas, and items in the AHMS correspondence suggest that the Panic of 1893 was felt in the Southwest earlier than it was in some other parts of the country.

Its severity was measured in the drop in funds raised locally and in those which came into the AHMS home office.

Social unrest was also noted: Late in January 1893, a 3-year-old girl was raped and murdered in Paris, Texas. A Negro, Henry Smith, was accused. Smith was seized by a mob and on Feb. 1 was lynched in what may have been the most brutual lynching to occur in the South. He was bound in a chair fixed on top of a cotton float. The child's father, with a white-hot tinners' iron, seared Smith's flesh starting at the feet and moving upward. The torture ended by silencing his tongue and putting out his eyes. The mob then saturated Smith with oil, piled combustibles around him and set him afire. Pleas from Governor Jim Hogg for mercy went unheeded.[8]

Scofield was not in Paris, Texas, but received reports from his associate Luther Rees and from Judge D. H. Scott. Scofield wrote Clark on the 4th, saying he was:

> . . . full of grief and indignation because of the Paris outrage. When I heard of the burning, with tortures unspeakable, of that negro, I felt resolved to leave Texas. . . . But now I feel like staying just because such things are possible here.
>
> The outrage committed by the negro, and that committed upon him, alike illustrate the problem to be solved here. Surely the Gospel is the only remedy.[9]

What had happened was completely in accord with the picture of man and society which Dispensationalists like to draw from I Timothy 4 and II Timothy 3. From 1893 (and before) right down to the present day, Dispensational preaching has obtained great satisfaction from similar tragedies. They cite them as proof that the picture given in I Timothy 4 and II Timothy 3 is the inevitable fate for society—Christian and otherwise. That with the corollary that the Lord could be back before the meeting ended.

The failing-church-any-moment syndrome, derived from J. N. Darby's "church in ruins" axiom meant that neither Scofield nor Rees could offer the citizens of Paris, Texas, anything which would help them out of the moral pit which the Henry Smith incident revealed. Scofield's impulse to leave Texas was natural to his theology. No doubt the Main Street Church (the Congregational work there) did snatch a few souls, but that could hardly be described as prevailing against the "Gates of Hell" which had opened right in town.

Even while apparently under the shock of the Paris outrage, Scofield could, in the same letter (February 4, 1893) speak of Congregational work in El Paso, all the way across the state. Under his superintendence, progress was reported. The Rio Grande Training School for Mexican workers was established in El Paso. A letter in March notes that workers from the school had been blessed with some success in itinerant work

among Mexicans living in the county. To back up the school, it was decided to establish a Congregational Church in El Paso. To prepare for the opening service on March 2, 1893, word was taken to each house in El Paso by the distribution of a flyer: A copy was preserved among the Scofield letters in the Amisted collection although Scofield does not appear to have had anything to do with its preparation.

Scofield was also president of the Board of Trustees of Lake Charles College, a Congregational school in the Louisiana city. In the same letter, Scofield notes that conditions in that area were difficult; there was smallpox at Jennings, La: A syndicate was holding land prices high and discouraging settlement. Church workers supposedly recruited from the North, failed to report for duty. But a new church of 25 members was being organized at Oberlin La.[10]

Despite the lynching, Paris was the bright spot in Scofield's district. At the end of March 1893, Scofield reported to Clark that the work (Main Street Congregational Church) was assuming self-support.[11] Luther Rees, trained by Scofield, was pastor, and he was to remain associated with Scofield up to the end of the latter's life. Judge D. H. Scott, who will be referred to several times as the story progresses, was to continue a leading member of the church.

Main Street Church had been able to afford printed letterheads. A letter from Luther Rees to Dr. J. H. Clark is in the AHMS, Amisted Collection[12] The letterhead displays a Scripture quotation: "Behold, I Come Quickly" (Rev. 22:12). That quotation on the letterhead is absolutely the ONLY premillenial reference in the entire group of letters addressed to AHMS by Scofield or anyone else: We consider it entirely probable that Rees, like most other Dispensationalists, thought or talked as though "Quickly" in that verse means "soon." That idea is the basis for the Dispensational cliche about the "Soon-coming Lord," so often heard from pulpits and in the religious media.

The Greek word "Tachu" used in the original, refers to the rate of movement or of appearance. To use it as Dispensatinalists do, making "quickly" mean "soon" is bad language. Further it violates the principle laid down by the Lord, Himself: "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of Heaven, but my Father only" *(Matt. 24:36)*. Any man who claims that the Lord is coming soon, "knows" something that only the Father was to know. The verse states that the Father is not sharing His knowledge with people anywhere, even in Texas, so the passage on the letterhead is incorrectly used.

Among the 1893 correspondence between Scofield and Clark is an exchange regarding a request from a Mrs. Blakeslee of Brackettville, Texas, regarding a possible Congregational work there. Brackettville, county seat of Kenney County, is in the Rio Grande Valley about midway between Uvalde and Del Rio (1980 population: 1,539): Scofield suggested

that a work there could not become self-supporting in 20 years, hence the appeal of Mrs: Blakeslee could not be heeded.[13]

Scofield indicated a preference to build up strong churches in major centers. El Paso and Paris are typical: As the works in the main centers built up, he hoped that they would serve as "mother" churches and reach out to unchurched smaller communities: This is essentially the method used successfully during many periods of growth during the church era and in strategic centers of missionary growth. But such a vision was completely contrary to the failing church view which Scofield was proclaiming in his correspondence course and which is a hallmark of his teaching.

The views expressed to Rev. Clark were a complete contrast to the Dispensational views. The difference in Scofield's viewpoints in the two ministries is not just a case of "wearing another hat:" Rather it suggests that Scofield was playing two entirely different roles, roles which were calculated to produce different results. But the two views were utterly inconsistent. Congregational churches in major centers in Texas did prosper, but Socfield's vision of Congregationalism expressed to Rev: Clark was never shared either by churches in Texas nor by denominational leadership.

Throughout this period, Scofield was also head of the Southwestern School of the Bible in Dallas, forerunner of the present Dallas Theological Seminary. That school, now located on Swiss Avenue, Dallas, is a major center for the dissemination of Scofield's views.

We have noted that it is hardly likely that Scofield could have carried out his responsibilities as superintendent of the AHMS by confining trips on their account to the period of release from the pulpit for conference work. He must have done a lot of traveling. And travel in those days was a time-consuming ordeal. Much of it meant sitting up in a hard-backed seat in a day coach, with smoke and cinders from the locomotive and dust from the right-of-way pouring in the windows: Some trips, especially those to conference points could have been a bit easier, thanks to Mr. Pullman's sleeping car. But the ordeal of travel was such that there must be some question of how much detailed direction Scofield was able to give the various posts which were his roles.

In the AHMS collection, we have the first reference to Hettie as a helper. On April 10, 1893, a money order for $70.00 was forwarded to Rev. J. Clark. The accompanying note bears a signature "Mrs. C. I. Scofield." The remittance was identified as a sum raised by the Women's Missionary Society of First Church, Dallas. But when we compared the signature on the note with Hettie's signature in family legal documents, and with Cyrus' signature on many letters, it became evident that Cyrus signed Hettie's name.

Further evidence of Scofield's peripatetic role are two more letters, one dated April 26, 1893, indicating his willingness to go from Dallas to Saratoga, N.Y., to a meeting of the society (AHMS), and the second, dated May 26, 1893, handwritten on the letterhead of the Fred Harvey Eating House and Hotel at Hutchinson, Kansas, while he was en route to Saratoga. The idea of Scofield being served his repast by a Harvey Girl provides a human interest touch. But the trip meant an absence of several weeks from both the pulpit of First Church and the superintendency.

Either The American Home Missionary Society did not find Scofield's Dispensationalism incongruous with its position, or else, it was officially unaware of the prophetic bent of First Church (Dallas) and its pastor. Whatever, in November 1893, they invited Scofield to become superintendent of missions in Colorado and the surrounding area. This would naturally mean more travel. A compromise was arranged. The church agreed to officially grant Scofield five months vacation each year if he would continue as pastor. This would leave him committed to the pulpit for but seven months.[14]

A call from a church in Massachusetts, which came at the end of 1895, meant leaving Dallas and the end of Scofield's connection with The American Home Missionary Society. His superintendence appears, as we have noted, to have made little impress on the Congregational denomination in the states under his charge. That denomination never became a leader in the "Bible Belt." Scofield's own groups led in promoting church irrelevance and imminent Rapture. Why did he take and hold the superintendent's post?

CHAPTER 20 NOTES

1. "As on Eagle Wings", notes on a sermon delivered at Chicago Avenue Church, Chicago, Sunday, August 9, 1903, by Rev. C. I. Scofield, D.D. The message was delivered at a date later than the period covered by this chapter. The Horse Guards reference is made in such a way that Scofield gives the impression of being a world traveler.
2. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 88.
3. *That Hideous Strength*, by C. S. Lewis, MacMillan, 1948, pp. 174—5.
4. Sandeen, *op. cit.*, p. 80.
5. The Amisted Research Center receives support from the American Missionary Center and the United Church Board for Homeland Missions. The Scofield letters were included in a collection of documents which had been held by the Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, prior to being turned over to Amisted.
6. Dispensationalism has developed set terms and has applied special meanings to some words and phrases, which makes its language distinctive. This provides a certain bond which helps give its adherents a sense of belonging. Syndicated colmunist Sydney J. Harris in his column of Jan. 22, 1973, entitled "How Slang Conceals Dishonesty" notes the cohesiveness of special language and jargon, but suggests that such special language can be very immoral. We must have questions about the jargon of Dispensationalism.

7. Letter to J. B. Clark, April 2, 1889.
8. Information on the lynching was supplied by the Texas State Archives, Austin, Texas. Information included copies of documents and relevant excerpts from *The Negro in Texas,* 1874-1900, by L. D. Rice, Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, La.
9. Scofield's letter to Clark, February 4, 1893.
10. Letter of February 4, 1893.
11. Letter of March 20, 1893.
12. Brackettville was the subject of two letters to J. B. Clark, both typed March 20, 1893. The recent telephone directory carrying listings for the Brackettville Exchange shows three churchs, Baptist, Methodist and Catholic.
13. Letter of March 20, 1893.
14. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

CHAPTER 21

The "Balmy" Niagara Bible Conference

"Our hearts be pure from evil
That we may see aright
The Lord in rays eternal
Of resurrection light,
And, listening to His accents
May hear, so calm and plain
His own All Hail! and hearing
May raise the victor strain."

John of Damascus, 8th Century[1]

The heart of the religious system which made Scofield's name famous is its prophetic stance. The proponents of that system claim that the Scofield prophetic ideas represent a recovery of "lost truths," lost since the early days of the church. That point is not confirmed by careful scholarship. As F. Roy Coad says:

> Few fragments have survived from the earliest days of the Church's history, and it would be wrong to read into the ideas of such fragments as we have any of our modern formulated systems. Their one supreme hope was the Second Advent and detail was of secondary importance.[2]

The ideas which were to be popularized by Scofield's work, were hammered into presentable shape by a series of Bible and Prophetic Conferences held in various cities in North America beginning in 1875. The most important was the Niagara Bible Conference, held, as its name indicates, at Niagara Falls, on the Canadian side.

Scofield, taking advantage of the long vacations granted by First Church, began attending the conference in 1887. Trumbull, noting that Scofield's first published work (in 1888) *Rightly Dividing The Word of Truth* was completed at Niagara, said:

> The work of making the little book was a time-consuming and laborious task for him then and "spoiled" his vacation (1888) entirely one summer at Niagara. But what a blessing it has been to multitudes of others![3]

(The manuscript apparently went directly from the conference grounds to Loizeaux Brothers, New York, the Plymouth Brethren "house" publishers. They still have it on their list nearly a century later.)

Later on, when A. C. Gaebelein was recounting his relationship with Scofield, he spoke of "balmy days of the Niagara Bible Conference." He implied that Scofield agreed with that value-judgment.

The Niagara Conference, at its 1878 session, had adopted a series of resolutions setting out its views and purpose. Relevant at this point in our story is Article XIV:

> We believe that the world will not be converted during the present dispensation, but is fast ripening for judgment, while there will be a fearful apostasy in the professing Christian body; and hence that the Lord Jesus will come in person to introduce the millennial age, when Israel shall be restored to their own land, and the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord; and that this personal and premillennial advent is the blessed hope set before us in the Gospel for which we should be constantly looking: Luke 12:35–40; 17:26–30; 18:8; Acts 15:14–17; 2 Thess. 2:3–8; 2 Tim. 3:1–5; Tit. 2:11–15.[4]

Not only was the position of the Article adhered to by the conference leadership but a significant part of the group interpreted Matthew 24, I Timothy 4, II Timothy 3 and Revelation 9-19 as the only future for the world. That future held only a succession of natural catastrophes, war, famine, want, disease, repression and torture.

As Richard Weaver has said, "ideas do have consequences:" One consequence of the Niagara Conference "balmy" days has been to give to the church, especially in North America, a negative hope. As Kenneth Genry said:

> Unfortunately neither pre- nor amillennialism can break from the chains of pessimism concerning the future course of this world. Some people think that this mindset of doom has a debilitating effect on long-range Christian cultural and political endeavor: "where there is no vision, the people perish" (Prov. 29:18).[5]

How did this happen? How does it relate to Scofield?

The Niagara Conference grew out of a major effort which originated with the Plymouth Brethren. In the period after the Civil War, they pushed very hard to get general acceptance for that interest in prophecy which had started in England following the French Revolution. While there had been millennial elements in the movement which forced the United States into the Civil war, the Plymouth Brethren position had not completely taken over. The church or at least a large part of it, had to be directed to the view that its hope was in its own failure.

In speaking of the spread of Premillennialism, according to the Plymouth Brethren, keep in mind that statement of Ernest Sandeen:

> But when everything has been said about the imperceptible and silent influence of the Brethren teaching, when full account of the energies and skills of all the Brethren teachers and writers has been taken, something still seems to be lacking.[6]

Some of this is noted in the area of our study, but even with study, full explanation eludes the student.

The Niagara Conference itself originated with an informal conference in New York in 1868 by men associated with the millenarian

periodical "Waymarks in the Wilderness."[7] Several leaders of this informal group died during the early 1870's and the group was reconstituted in 1875. It met thereafter for one or two weeks each year, usually in a resort setting. From 1883 to 1897, it met at Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario. In the story, we detect traces of what Blair Neatby called "the High-Church" origin of the Brethren.[6] One of the leaders wrote of the 1897 session:

> To an uninitiated on-looker, Niagara Conference must be something of a mystery. In the quietest and sweetest of retreats, without ostentation and with only the nearest semblance of advertising; with no attractions of singing or musical instruments, without badges, salutes, mottoes, sensational oratory, or any of the usual accessories of a modern conventicle, a large company of sober, cultivated, well-mannered people come together, year after year, ostensibly to study concerning "the things of the Kingdom of God." . . . But what is Niagara Convention?
>
> To answer is both hard and easy. In Apostolic days the name "Believer" stood for all that involved separation unto Christ, and the reproach of His cross. The name "Christian" to-day is lost in an accretion of worldly maxims and practices. The Niagara company are simply aiming to manifest the primitive, New Testament idea of an ecclesia.[9]

James H. Brookes, whom Scofield claimed as mentor, described the 1892 conference in a way which would have brought joy to the heart of any Brethren conditioned in its "High-Church" tradition:

> The meeting this year, commencing July 7 and closing on the evening of July 13, was more largely attended than ever before. Often every seat in the pavilion was occupied, and the porches were filled with eager hearers of the Word. The place too becomes more beautiful as the years go by, and it would be difficult to find a spot better suited to the quiet and prayerful study of the Sacred Scriptures. The building in which the Conference meets, over-looking lake Ontario and the river Niagara, and surrounded by green trees, is secluded from the noise of the world: and so excellent were the arrangements for the accommodation of the guests, both in Queen's Royal Hotel and in the boarding houses of the village, that not a word of complaint was heard from any one.[10]

It is obvious that the "balmy" atmosphere was originated by careful selection of the "quietest and sweetest of retreats," "secluded from the noise of the world," with "excellent arrangements for the accommodation of guests"—all this to contemplate with apparent delight the prospect of suffering, want, torture, disease, death and worse, the failure of the church. If this could positively be supported from Scripture, fine. But to hold so strongly to what is only an interpretation, an interpretation of suffering for others, and to contemplate it in a setting of luxury! Is it incongruous to have so done? Interestingly enough, up to the present, the Dispensational movement has been so lacking in social concern that the incongruity of the Niagara position has not been noticed.

As with almost everything else about Scofield, examination of available material suggests that his overt role was far less important

than has been implied by those who wrote about him. Few published messages bear his name and we feel that he may have been more of a listener and learner. In the 1895 session he delivered a message entitle "Barabbas' Theory of the Atonement."[11] The idea was that Barabbas, saved by a substitute, was like the believer, saved by the substitutionary work of Christ. The flaw in the message is that it overlooks the gross depravity affecting those involved in the crucifixion drama on the official side. To assume the redemption of Barabbas is worse than romantic, it is dangerously close to blasphemy.

In 1897, when Scofield traveled to Niagara from Massachusetts, he brought a message entitled "The Return of The Lord."[12] It really was not original, and it was along a pattern which has become standard in Scofield's following: Early in the message, he said:

> The signs and portents of the end-time are now so many and so omnious that men of vision everywhere, and in every walk of life, are taking note of them; and this quite apart from the interpretation of them which prophecy gives. Men like Gladstone and Bismarck have said that the catastrophe of present day civilization is near and cannot be averted; that the destructive agencies are more and mightier than the forces of conservatism, and that no man may predict what form the reconstructed social order will assume after the inevitable cataclysm. Emperor William has said to a friend of his boyhood, that society to-day lives over a volcano, the moment of eruption may be postponed, but cannot be averted. A French member of the Institute says, "I can almost her the gallop of the man on horseback."[13]

This was the proper style of discussion in the light of the conference's declared purpose. Continuing, Scofield tried to link the disaster with the idea of a "soon-coming" Lord:

> Well, that is just what we have been saying for some years. We have risen from our study of the Word of God to come up here year by year to utter this warning—that the age ends in disaster, in ruin, in the great, final, world-catastrophe; and for saying it we have been branded as pessimists.[13]

Yet, while he tries to link disaster with the return of Jesus Christ, we must hedge just a bit:

> When will our Lord return? We shall find a two-fold answer. *Absolutely,* that is as to the time fixed in the divine purpose, we do not know, we are not told. The admonition is,"Watch therefore; for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come. But know this, that if the goodman of the house had known in what watch the thief would come, he would have watched, and would not have suffered his house to be broken up. Therefore, be ye also ready: for in such an hour as you think not, the Son of man cometh." Matt. xxiv. 42-44; also, Matt. xxv. 13; Acts i. 7.
>
> But, while the time according to earth's chronology is uncertain, the time relatively to other predicted events and epochs is not left in doubt.[14]

And the reason he was forced to hedge, just as every Premillenialist must do today, is the words of Jesus Christ, Himself: "But of the day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of Heaven, but my Father only" *(Matthew 24:36)*.

In the light of that statement, Scofield dared not openly disobey the Lord and fix a date, even though the logic of his scheme required it. Worse, he had the example of William Miller and his date-setting. To avoid overt disobedience to the Lord and to avoid the example of William Miller, Scofield had to indulge in semantics as we note in the quotation. He had painted himself into a corner. As Roy Coad said:

> It is here useful to notice one interesting fact. Almost invariably interpretation has been vitiated by the reluctance or incapacity of commentators to visualise their own age as other than end time. As a consequence, beliefs are in a constant state of revision and restatement.[15]

Coad overlooked the capacity of Dispensationalists for semantics: But Scofield failed to avoid a trap which the early Plymouth Brethren worked themselves into. As Blair Neatby notes:

> If anyone had told the first Brethren that three quarters of a century might elapse and the Church still be on earth, the answer would probably have been a smile, partly of pity, partly of disapproval, wholly of incredulity. Yet so it has proved. It is impossible not to respect hopes so congenial to an ardent devotion; yet it is clear now that Brethrenism took shape under the influence of a delusion, and that that delusion was a decisive element in all its distinctive features.[16]

Just as the early Brethren could not have imagined the end of the 19th Century being possible, so the Niagara attendees probably could not in anyway have imagined the now approaching end of the 20th Century which looms before us. Neatby, being as fair as possible, referred to the Brethren hope as a "delusion." In a like manner, assuming at this point sincerity, the best value we can place on the hopes of the Niagara group is likewise "delusion."

The leadership of the gatherings was in the hands of James H: Brookes until his death in 1897. The corresponding secretary was Rev: W. R. Erdman (the group was at one time heavy with Presbyterians). While Brookes was Darbyite right down the line, Erdman was Premillenial without holding rigid Darbyite views. A. J. Gordon, a Baptist from Boston, was prominent in the group. Gordon died in 1895, and the group seemed to lose something with his passing. When Brookes died early in 1897, before the conference of that year, A. C. Gaebelein took the lead role. He was, however, unable to keep the conference going. The conference was failing to attract younger men as the founders passed on, and certain differences in prophetic view made unity, and even functioning, impossible once Brookes' personality was no longer commanding. And it is possible that Gaebelein's vision, which was to

produce the Scofield Reference Bible, was making the conference irrelevant.

Because of its impact on eschatological thinking, the Niagara Conference has been studied by George H. Ladd *(The Blessed Hope)*. C. Norman Kraus *(Dispensationalism in America)*, Ernest Sandeen *(The Roots of Fundamentalism)*, and it has been reported from a different view by George W. Dollar *(Fundamentalism in America)*. And we have the benefit of two unpublished studies by Richard H. Reiter (Trinity Seminary). All the studies make it clear that despite an official stand on prophecy as set out in Article XIV, reproduced above, (the now widely accepted Dispensational view), unity among the brethren (small "b") was not achieved. Such lack of unity seems inherent in any group where the influence of the Brethren (capital "B") is felt. The Brethren were, in the 19th Century, noted for disunity and its promotion under the guise of separation and the seeking of doctrinal purity.

The disunity of Niagara appears to have been present for almost the life of the conference. It makes one wonder about the real basis for Gaebelein's value-judgment "balmy." Robert Cameron of Brantford, Ontario noted:

> At the 1884 Conference it came to be "fashion" of every speaker to "ring the changes" on the possibility of Christ coming any moment—before the morning dawned, before the meeting closed, and even before the speaker had completed his address.[17]

Cameron's statement makes it evident that the disagreement which seethed under the "balmy" surface of the conference was, as Reiter succinctly puts it "Rupture about the Rapture."[18]

The "Rapture-Rupture" essentially had Robert Cameron, Nathaniel West, and later W. R. Erdman, holding for a "Rapture" at the very end of the age. They were to be supported by W. G. Moorehead of Xenia Theological Seminary. An apparent majority of the Niagarans, including Brookes, Scofield, Gaebelein, Parson, Gordon and George Needham, were holding for what has become the traditional pretribulation view.

The conference sessions were officially reported in Brookes' magazine *The Truth* and A. J. Gordon's publication *Watchword*. As West's opposition to the party line grew, he took to other publications to air his views.

Despite careful programming, the difference of view was never resolved during the life of the conference. Gaebelein notes:

> . . . I roomed with Dr. West, but it was a sleepless night; on towards five in the morning did 1 get some rest. Dr. West was a great scholar and strong advocate of the premillennial coming of our Lord. But we differed on the church and the great tribulation.
>
> Unlike Brookes, Gordon, Parsons, Needham, myself and others, Dr. West believed that the church would be on earth till the very end of that

> period of trouble. He tried hard to win me over to his side. . . . It was a hot conflict which strengthened greatly my belief in my view, which I believe is based on Scripture. We were good friends.[19]

The differences between prophetic teachers caused concern among other Fundamental leaders. Cautions were uttered. Both D. L. Moody and A. J. Gordon warned about the effects of the continued argument, the "Rupture about the Rapture."[20] But no one yielded. Our own subject, C. I. Scofield, is never mentioned in connection with the disputes. His messages show that he was firmly committed to the Darbyite position which was later to be woven into the structure of his major work.

The differences persisted after the Niagara Conference was discontinued: The personal conflicts appear to have been resolved. For instance, Scofield was later to use two of the opposing view, W. R: Erdman and W. G. Moorehead, as editors of the Scofield Bible. But so successful was the Gaebelein party that after the middle of the 20th Century, the recovery of a differing point of view was to be almost like recovering lost truths.

As we consider the implications of such a great area of difference, a comment by Duncan McDougall is relevant:

> Be not deceived! God is not the Author of confusion. He has not given us the Book of Revelation to put our minds in a muddle, nor yet as a Happy Hunting Ground for our imagination. We should be very careful how we speculate or dogmatize about any prophecy that is as yet unfulfilled.[21]

It must be recognized that it is impossible for God to lead people in different directions in the same situation. So it must be obvious that at least one of the differing parties in the Niagara "Rapture-Rupture" was committed to a position which belied their claim to be in the Will of the Lord they proclaimed.

Recently, T. S. Randell speaking of the matter of the Will of God, said:

> But it is possible to extract from the Bible phrases and segments of sentences and employ them as justification for some course of action that we have already decided upon. The words of the Bible are then taken in the sense we have decided previously to give them.[22]

Continuing, he says:

> It is as we permit the principles of Scripture to permeate our thinking that we think God's thoughts after him.[23]

We must consider Scripture itself at this point. Paul, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, besought the church (and the Niagarans must be included):

> That we all come in the unity of faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness

> of Christ: That we henceforth be no more children tossed to and fro, carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive *(Ephesians 4:13,* 14).

We would submit that what Paul suggested was normal for the church was a bit out of reach during the "Rapture-Rupture." As we move on we quote a statement of Duncan McDougall which must fit here:

> THERE IS NOT A BIBLE TEACHER NOR ANYONE ELSE LIVING IN THE WORLD TODAY WHO HAS FOUND A SECRET RAPTURE IN THE BIBLE BY HIS OWN INDEPENDENT STUDY OF BIBLE ITSELF. These teachers all come to the Bible with cut-and-dried theories which they have learnt elsewhere, and twist and torture texts to fit the theory.[24]

And it is just that "Secret Rapture" which was Gaebelein's and Scofield's position.

Years later, Gaebelein mentioned something else which he felt contributed to the Niagara breakup. As he was giving his version of the Scofield story, he mentioned a "serpent" which crept into the gathering. The "serpent" was Edward Irving (1792-1834). As Gaebelein told the story:

> Toward the end of the Niagara meetings several of the teachers, influenced by one man, who was considered an outstanding biblical and ecclesiastical scholar (as he undoubtedly was), began to abandon this distinction and branded it a mere invention. One of them went so far as to say that the teaching that the Lord would remove His true Church before the predicted Great Tribulation judgment, and that so far as His coming for His saints is concerned that it might occur at any moment, originated in the days of Edward Irving and his spurious gift of tongues' revival. And so the blessed hope of the imminent coming of the Lord was more or less charged to the influence of subtle demons.[25]

Gaebelein's opinion of Irving has been accepted throughout the Dispensational movement. As recently as 1976, John Walvoord made this comment:

> The often-repeated charge that Darby secured his pretribulationism from Edward Irving has never been actually documented. One can hardly account for the wide acceptance of pretribulationism by Plymouth Brethren, who are devoted students of the bible, to the offering of this view by a person who had no reputation for orthodoxy.[26]

By using a bit of semantic writing, Walvoord tries to cover the origin of the ideas he propounds. In doing so, he differs markedly from British writers who are closer to the subject. Neatby, writing in 1901, Howard Rowdon in 1967, F. Roy Coad in 1968 and Iain Murray in 1971, all find direct and reasonable links between the ideas of Irving and the role

of J. N. Darby.[27] The link is so evident that a denial, using semantics on Walvoord's part, does not "wash."

Possibly a reaction to the Irving link helped break up the Niagara meetings. Gaebelein should have been more cautious when he wrote in 1942. In the light of works cited above, there is no excuse for Walvoord's position in 1976.

A statement which Sidney Watson placed in his sensational prophetic soap-opera novel, "The Twinkling of an Eye," shows the mind-set which produced Niagara's Article XIV, the Scofield Bible and Walvoord's statement:

> But, even as I pen this millenium-like picture, I know, from the Word of God, that it *cannot be before* Christ comes. But I seek to arouse every *Christian to* God's call to them on this matter. You, who profess to be Christ's, dare not refuse this truth, save at the peril of losing the *Crown* of Life.
>
> The vast bulk of the churches, I know, preach, that the world will continually improve until the earth shall be fit for Christ to come and reign. But I defy any cleric or layman to show me a single word of scripture that gives the faintest colour to that belief, or statement—unless the person wrests the passage so advanced from its distinctly marked *dispensational* setting.[28]

Watson started with the Dispensational idea fixed in his mind and read Scripture accordingly. The movement has followed him.

Gaebelein never got away from his "doom-boom" view which was promoted in the "balmy" Niagara Conference in the luxury of Queen's Royal Hotel. Writing in 1942, he said:

> The truth about the political, moral and religious future of our age, as revealed in the Bible, is clearly stated and unfolded in the Reference Bible. Thousands of Christians, through its enlightening comments, received the true light as to the character of world conditions as they were almost half a century ago, and were delivered from the unscriptural expectation of an ever-increasing and improving betterment of the age.
>
> Then came the terrific crash of 1914, and a good part of the world was plunged into the great catastrophe which we have labeled the first World War. The fact remains that before the war ever came into existence this group of seven men, under the leadership of the late Dr. C. I. Scofield, had sounded the alarm, not as prophets, but as sane and spiritual exponents of sacred prophecy.[29]

That statement was made 40 years before this page was written.

In 1981, Columnist William Pfaff noted the "doom-boom" speaking from a political viewpoint, but well aware of the religious input:

> The country seems resigned to the worst, and this, perhaps, the reason for its current taste in apocalyptic preachings, however idiotic. It can be comforting to think, when times are bad, that events are out of human hands. If we blame it on God, we are free of responsibility.[30]

Pfaff doesn't know how much of that thought pattern is a result of the influence of the "balmy" Niagara Bible Conference and of Scofield's time spent there. But we can see a direct link.

CHAPTER 21 NOTES

1. John of Damascus, 8th Century, translated by John Mason Neale, 1862, as second stanza of the hymn "The Day of Resurrection."
2. F. Roy Coad, *"Prohpetic Developments* with Particular Reference to the Early Brethren Movement," Christian Brethren Research Fellowship, Pinner, Middlesex, England, 1966, p. 11.
3. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, pp. 61, 62.
4. Resolution was printed as Appendix A of "The Roots of Fundamentalism etc.," by Ernest Sandeen, University of Chicago, 1970.
5. Kenneth Gentry, Pastor Midway Presbyterian Church, Jonesboro, Tenn. Book review, "When Will it All End?", *Christianity Today,* Nov. 8, 1978, pp. 42, 43. Gentry "broke the ice" by taking notice in an evangelical publication of the resurgent postmillenial movement.
6. Sandeen, *op. cit.*, p. 80.
7. Sandeen, p. 133. The 1868 meeting included James Inglis, editor of "Waymarks," and George Needham, who had recently emigrated from Ireland. Needham claimed that the idea originated in Ireland (Powerscourt?). Incidentally, Needham is another figure in the line of prophetic development about whom very little is known.
8. W. Blair Neatby, *A History of The Plymouth Brethren, London,* 1901.
9. *Watchword* (periodical) No. 19 (1897), p. 144.
10. *Truth* (periodical) No. 18 (1892), p. 936.
11. Frequently circulated as a tract.
12. *Truth* 19 (1897) p. 385.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 385.
14. *Ibid.*, pp. 387, 388.
15. Coad, *op. cit.*, p. 10.
16. Neatby, *op. cit.*, p. 339.
17. Robert Cameron, *Scriptural Truth about the Lord's Return,* New York, 1922, pp. 145–146.
18. Richard R. Reiter, *The Decline of the Niagara Bible Conference and Breakup of the United Premillenial Movement.* Unpublished paper, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 1976, p. 2. See also, Reiter, *The Rapture Controversary in Late Nineteenth Century American Fundamenalism,* unpublished paper, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 1980.
19. A. C. Gaebelein, *Half a Century, The Autobiography of a Servent,* Publication Office "Our Hope," New York, 1930, pp. 153–154. The incident described actually occurred at a conference sponsored by Brookes in St. Louis, but was entirely typical of the sort of proselyting which went on at Niagara and when attendees got together anywhere.
20. Reiter, *Decline.*
21. Duncan McDougall, *The Rapture of the Saints,* 0.F.P.M. Publishers, Blackwood, New Jersey, 1970, p. 56.
22. T. S. Rendall, *The Lord Led Me—But did He?,* The Prairie Overcomer, May 1982, p. 202.
23. Rendall, *op. cit.*, p. 207.
24. McDougall, *op. cit.*, p. 55.
25. Gaebelein, *The Story of the Scofield Reference Bible, Moody* Monthly, January 1943, p. 278.

26. John R. Walvoord, *The Blessed Hope and The Tribulation,* Zondervan, 1976, p. 48.
27. Walvoord's denial of an Irvingite influence is most remarkable since all the books mentioned are in the Library at Dallas Seminary and were available to Walvoord. Neatby has been on hand for years. *Rowdon's* work was acquired in April 1968, Coad's study in December 1978 and the paperback edition of Murray's *The Puritan Hope* was acquired in March 1976, according to notations in the volumes. Thus they were readily available to Walvoord as he wrote.
28. Sidney Watson, "In The Twinkling of an Eye," p. 197. Note that Watson makes salvation dependent on a certain Rapture view.
29. Gaebelein, *op. cit.,* Moody Monthly, October 1942, p. 66.
30. William Pfaff, *"Apocalyptic Preachings Focus on Political Fears," The Chicago Tribune,* Friday, March 20, 1981.

CHAPTER 22

Into the Mauve Decade

> *"Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery."*
>
> I Tim. 4:14

The peripatetic activities of C. I. Scofield related in the previous chapter took us into the middle of the 1890's. In relating Scofield's activities in Dallas, we must make a chronological backtrack to 1890—the opening of the "Mauve" decade.

In July 1890, Scofield suffered the first of recurrent illnesses which were to trouble him until his death: The Death Certificate issued 31 years later, lists cardial vascular problems as a cause of death. But Scofield never behaved like a heart patient. As Scofield's life shapes up under examination and as recurring periods of illness are noted in succeeding chapters, a comment of Dr. William Sadler should be seriously considered:

> No one can appreciate fully as a doctor the amazingly large percentage of human disease and suffering which is directly traceable to worry, fear, conflict, immorality, dissipation, and ignorance to wholesome thinking and unclean living. *The sincere acceptance of the teachings of Christ with respect to the life of mental peace and joy, the life of unselfish thought and clean living would at once wipe out more than half the difficulties and sorrows of the human race.*[1]

It has been established that Scofield's life included certain deficiencies that might have brought his situation into the scope of Sadler's statement. In that may be a partial explanation for some of the unaccountable illnesses.

The 1890 illness did not interfere with two new publishing ventures by Scofield. A monthly, *The Believer,* made its appearance in July with a 16-page issue. Scofield, as editor, listed three reasons for starting the magazine:

1. to bear testimony to a "body of truth being neglected"
2. to aid Bible study
3. to correct the "nearly complete effacement of the line separating the Church from the world."

Reason No. 1 is a typical Dispensational "warhorse" trotted out at intervals to convince the unconvinced and to reassure the convinced. But it is not really true: Was he, in No. 3, hinting at the famous "five

don'ts" of Fundamentalism? The magazine survived for nine issues, the last appearing in March 1891.[2]

The second publication project of 1890 was the beginning of his Comprehensive Bible Correspondence Course.[3] While encouraging Bible study is most commendable, in the light of the work of Patrick Fairbairn, the Hodges, R. L. Dabney, Warfield and others, it is most unfortunate that the course was one means of shackling the Dispensational idea on to American Christendom.[4] Scofield continued to direct the course until 1914 when it was taken over by the Moody Bible Institute.[5] Under Scofield's direction, the course enrolled some tens of thousands of students scattered all over the world. These students were all dedicated to the idea of the failing church.[6]

Scofield must have cast off his illness in time to participate in the Texas State Fair of 1890: On Tennessee Day, he introduced Governor Robert Taylor of the "'Volunteer State." Many citizens of Dallas had come from Tennessee. Scofield's service in a Tennessee Regiment for one year of the war was being played up as an asset which made his ministry more acceptable to ex-Confederates: An eye-witness reported that he introduced to governor in "eloquent terms."[7] Possibly Scofield was more eloquent than truthful. That eloquence could have been the basis for two reputable publications asserting without contradiction by Scofield and his supporters that he was born in Tennessee rather than Michigan.[8]

BeVier describes another activity of Scofield's which was intended to reach out beyond the bounds of the First Congregational Parish:

> For a number of years prior to 1890 Scofield had been interested in foreign missions for several successive years he had been with Hudson Taylor, the founder and director of the China Inland Mission, at the Niagara Bible Conference. Scofield's contacts with Taylor caused his interest in missions to grow. After studying several possibilities Scofield's attention was turned to Central America, an unoccupied field from the Protestant viewpoint. With a plan in mind, Scofield in November, 1890 called Messrs. Powell, Rees and Nason to his home. Following this meeting the Central American Mission was organized on November 14, and has become another lasting evidence of Scofield's ministry. The organization was subsequently approved by the Church, whose members became enthusiastic supporters. The early support of the mission came largely from the Dallas church, but later its constituency became nationwide.[9]

But, as we will note later, the much traveled Scofield never ventured into those countries where the missionaries of the Central American Mission were laboring.

It is well that First Church built up its own staff of men with pulpit capability. The church records noted that in May 1891, the Pastor's health failed from overwork.[10] Scofield was given a five-month vacation to recuperate. (Coincidentally, this period matched the time when the

bible Conferences were being held around the country. Or was this the time he saw the Horse Guards?) BeVier suggests that Scofield may never have adjusted to the hot summers in Dallas.[11] Details of health matters are so vague. By any measure, the church was growing despite a somewhat discontinuous pulpit presence on Scofield's part. Keep in mind the quotation from Neatby at the beginning of chapter 19.

During Scofield's frequent absences in 1890, 1891 and early 1892, Luther Rees, a graduate of the earlier class of 10, is noted as associate pastor.[12] Rees was ordained to the ministry by Scofield on June 1, 1892, Scofield preaching the sermon. The ordination sermon for Luther Rees has been preserved in a pamphlet bearing the title, "Jesus Christ as Preacher." The pamphlet bears the heading "Sermon preached by *Dr.* C. I. Scofield" (emphasis added). This is the first time we have noted the title "Dr." No research has yet uncovered any institution which in the early 1890's would have awarded a degree, academic or honorary to a preacher holding Dispensational views. Dispensationalism was then too much of an oddity to be accepted in academic circles.

The title "Dr." conveys a bit more prestige than just plain "Pastor" or "Mr." Scofield may have felt that "Dr." was more appropriate for the head of a growing church. But it is really not proper to award such a title to one's self—for it appears most likely that this is what occurred in Scofield's case.

Certain statements in the sermon deserve our consideration as they help to show the development of Scofield's theology and thought. On the third page of the pamphlet, we find:

> Will you bear with me while I just briefly name the doctrines that I found? First of all—his own absolute Deity; next, His own absolute humanity; then the inspiration and authority of Old Testament Scriptures, including the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch; the prophetic character of Daniel, and the truth of Old Testament miracles. All these affirm what is the true basis and frame-work of the teachings of Jesus Christ. Then again, himself presented as the Mediator between God and man; the necessity of the new birth; salvation through faith alone; the fatherhood of God limited to those who receive Jesus Christ as a Saviour; the eternal punishment of the unsaved; eternal assurance based on His own keeping power, and remission of sins through the shedding of His blood only; His own second advent, the ushering in of His millennial Kingdom; the privilege of prayer, and the duty of service. These great fundamental doctrines, which we are accustomed to hear called "Pauline," I find dear friends, upon the study of Christ's words alone, to be "Christine" as well as "Pauline."[13]

All of which, except for the "millennial kingdom," sounds quite orthodox. But on the next page, trading theology for evangelistic history, he finds things a bit out of line.

> Why friends, we, who are so accustomed to a style of evangelism just now that deals in sentiment and pretty songs, are amazed when we turn

> back to the preaching of Finney and find that the very substance of it was stiff doctrine. But, because it was *God's* doctrine, men fell in thousands at the feet of Jesus, so in our day we find Spurgeon and Moody, preachers of the dear old doctrines.[14]

The trouble is that it was the evangelism of Finney which started that very trend which Scofield complained of. His assertion that Spurgeon and Finney preached the same message is incorrect. The views of the two men were so far apart that reconciliation is impossible. The statement is another suggestion that Scofield's knowledge was superficial and his expressed views suited to occasion and congregation.

The charge to Rees ended the sermon:

> These men, my brother Rees, these are the soul winners; these are the heroes of faith; these will shine like the stars for evermore when the rosewater preachers of "sweetness and light" and of a bloodless atonement, are forgotten, if not damned.[15]

Unfortunately, Rees did not consistently carry out the obligations noted in the charge. A 1901 letter from Scofield to Mrs. A. P. Fitt (Emma Moody) notes that Rees had been "connected for years with a large investment house." Other reports indicate that Rees was never consistently in the full-time ministry.

Scofield's relations with Rees continued close after Rees took a charge in Paris, Texas: Judge D. H. Scott of the Paris congregation, in his euology, offered just after Scofield's passing, said: ". . . our little Church was so fond of him, he sometimes spent a whole week, teaching and preaching the word."[16]

The Scofield residence at 157 Holmes Avenue (present house number is 2819)[17] highlights a point of some interest. BeVier in his study comments that First Church was something of a neighborhood church. But it was not a neighborhood church in the vicinity of the sanctuary, but rather in the neighborhood on Holmes Avenue.[18] The membership list of 1893 showed 19 families living on Holmes Avenue between Grand and Forest Avenues, then definitely an upper middle class area. In addition to the three Scofields in the parsonage, BeVier noted the following and their business connections: Mrs: Ninnie Baird, Baird Baking Co.; The John Cravens, Mrs. Craven was a member of the Dealey family of the Dallas *Morning News;* The Edward Clardys, later, Pastor, Pilgrim Congregational Church; The Samuel Dealeys, Dealey Brothers Wholesale Lumber Co.' The George Dealeys, Dallas *Morning News*[19] The Fitzhugh Hawkes superintendent Sanger Brothers Department Store; The Theodore Mosher Family, Mosher Steel Company; The Thomas J. Jones family, Treasurer, Mosher Steel Co. (Mrs: Jones was a Mosher):[20] House calls to this group could conveniently be made without a horse and carriage and without utilizing the horse cars which were beginning to run in Dallas. The group could easily get together

socially: The distinction between church and private social affairs may have often been quite indistinct.

BeVier failed to follow to a conclusion the intriguing leads offered by the list of business connections. The Baird Baking Company still produces the staff of life in Dallas. Signs advertising Mrs. Baird's Bread are in plain sight on the freeways in Dallas, the trade being conducted under a name which honors Ninnie, herself.

The Mosher family at the time we refer to was deeply involved in laying the basis for the present Mosher Steel Company, leading fabricator and secondary producer of steel in Texas. The Moshers made no move toward primary production and thus were utterly dependent upon the "Steel Trust" (Carnegie, Frick, *et. al.)* for the basic materials of their business. The History of the Mosher Steel Company[21] indicates that its flow of basic steel was uninterrupted. Apparently they were able to live with the monopoly pricing system of the steel trust known as "Pittsburgh Plus."[22]

Bachelor Jones, who sold the 157 Holmes property to Scofield, was of the next generation of Joneses. With the Dealeys running one of Dallas' leading newspapers, it would appear that in the long run, Scofield and his intimates must have been receptive to the early advice of the superintendent from Boston, noted in chapter 17, about the place of the hoi polloi in the church. Certainly they were not in the leadership and do not appear to have been the pastor's intimates.

During the autumn of 1893, Scofield preached a series of Sunday sermons, largely on prophetic subjects, which were transcribed and published. The message of October 15, 1893, entitled "The Purpose of God in This Age" is of great interest. Firmly Dispensational, the message is committed to the irrelevant church and its replacement by others. The social effect of such a message on an upper middle class congregation, moving in places of social prominence in a growing city, must have been horrendous.

On page 19, Scofield says, speaking of the "age" or Dispensation concept:

> As you are aware, they are marked, as to their beginning, by some new probation for man, as to their ending by some act of judgment—for man always fails at last.[23]

The sermon is a rehash of the Scripturally unproven Darbyite chopup of Scripture: The sermon, on its page 23, is brimming over with Dispensational "hope," which is something very different from the "Blessed Hope":

> There is not a passage, nor a line, of Scripture which intimates that the world is to be converted during this age.
>
> . . .

> Nay, not Paul only, but the Lord also describes the whole course of this again terms which exclude the possibility of a converted world during its continuance. The parable of the tares in Matt.xiii declares in express terms that the children of the devil are to be mingled with the children of the kingdom until the end of the age. The *purpose of* God in this age, then, is the calling out of the church.[24]

This purpose was firmly held and propagated by both Darby and Scofield.

As Scofield waxed eloquent, he gave the congregation a distinction which can be only an exercise in semantics: "The evangelization of the world, then, and not its conversion, is the mission committed to us:" But conversion is the only valid measure of evangelization. Here Scofield ignores the principle of Isaiah 55:11. Further, he puts a limitation on the church which ignores the important message of Ephesians 3:

> To do this, to preach the gospel unto the uttermost parts of the earth, to offer salvation to every creature is our responsibility. It is the divinely appointed means for the calling out a people for his name, the church, the "Ecclesia."[25]

He would turn the task of changing the world over to another group, one which in the 1890's was indifferent to Jesus Christ, remains so today, is even active in opposing Him:

> It follows that the purpose of God in this age is not the establishment of the kingdom.
>
> I have already said that the kingdom is the great theme of the prophets. They tell us in perfectly simple, unambiguous language how the kingdom is to be brought in, who is to be its ruler, and the extent and character of that rule, and the result in the universal prevalence of peace and righteousness. We perceive at once that this kingdom is to regenerate society, to deal directly with economic questions, to concern itself with the temporal as well as with the eternal interests of man.[26]

While the possibility of social reform under the impact of the Gospel is noted, do we detect a note of horror at the possibility?

> That the preaching of the gospel produces everywhere many of the kingdom conditions is blessedly true. Where the gospel and an open Bible go, the humanities and ameliorations which are to have their full fruition in the kingdom age spring up. Even the unconverted acknowledge the new ethical ideal, and there is an immense quickening of the higher powers of man. These are gracious and beautiful results in which we may legitimately rejoice. They are vindications of the truth of our blessed faith.
>
> But what we need to guard ourselves against is the notion—now, alas! all but universally prevalent—that these results are the chief object and end of our mission; that we are sent into the world to civilize it. No, my hearers, these are its incidentals.[27]

In concluding the message, Scofield makes a firm and determined committment to irrelevancy: "We will not attempt in this age the work which God has reserved for the next."[28]

In November 1893, the church agreed to give Scofield five months vacation each year. He, in turn, agreed to serve as pastor for another seven.[29] The decision was made as a result of the attempt already mentioned of The American Home Missionary Society to give Scofield added responsibilities in connection with their work.

The Panic of 1893 threatened to wreck the arrangement. Dallas was affected by serious business failures. No doubt, the aspiring tycoons had to "pull in" a bit. The hoi polloi were still present in First Church. Scofield reported actual destitution among wage earners in the congregation.[30] The Church, however, did manage to pay Scofield's salary and even kept paid supplies in the pulpit during his absences.

By the end of 1894, the membership roll of the church stood at 550—all no doubt waiting for the "Any-Moment Rapture." At the 1895 annual meeting, the church, on Scofield's recommendation, voted to delete names of inactive members from the rolls. At this meeting the vacation-salary arrangement with Scofield was continued.[31]

In February 1895, D. L. Moody returned to Dallas to conduct another series of evangelistic meetings: Moody had been in Dallas in 1886 at Scofield's invitation. He had for several years previous to 1895 scheduled Scofield as a speaker at the summer conferences held at East Northfield:[32]

It would appear that the association between Scofield and Moody may have been responsible for the call received by Scofield to become pastor of the Trinitarian Congregational Church of East Northfield, Mass. As the notice of the call is recorded in an insert on page 162 of the Record Book of First Congregational Church (now Scofield Memorial Church), it refers to a call from the Trinitarian Congregational Church and "the accompanying presidency of the two Northfield preparatory schools which Moody had founded."[33] Scofield decided to accept the call and the Dallas church released him for one year.[34]

There is a serious question about the entry in the First Church Record Book. As will be discussed in the next chapter, at the time Scofield accepted the call to the church in East Northfield, no record can be found in the schools of any change in the presidencies of those two institutions.[35] No evidence has been found that the schools issued a call to Scofield, nor that any action of the church was in anyway binding on the schools: Those in the Dispensational community who hold, and some quite vigorously, that Scofield headed the preparatory schools are laboring under a delusion.

In accepting the call to Northfield, Scofield recommended his successor to the pulpit in Dallas. The recommendation was for one year, suggesting that Scofield either expected to return or else did not feel free to make his intentions clear to the Dallas congregation. He recommended Rev: William F. Reed of Avoca, Iowa, who was planning to

depart for the mission field late in 1896 and was willing to take the pulpit until he left for the field[36] Scofield recommended a salary of $1,200 for Reed. The church accepted both recommendations.

In January 1896, Scofield submitted his final annual pastor's report for his ministry in Dallas. It reviewed his 14 years. Note was made of the fact that the membership had growth from 14: Some 812 members had been received (75 percent "upon confession of their faith in Jesus Christ"). The actual active membership at the time of the report was 533. The conclusion of the report had several recommendations including a proposal to organize a "Bible School" in Dallas. The report came to Dallas from Northfield where Scofield was already at work.[37]

CHAPTER 22 NOTES

1. William C. Sadler, *The Practice of Psychiatry,* St. Louis, Mo., C. V. Mosby Co., 1953, p. 1008. Originally noted as a quotation in S. I. McMillan, *None of These Diseases,* Revell, 1963.
2. BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 51 and Footnote 123.
3. BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 54.
4. The diligence of Scofield and others to implant the idea of church failure must amaze the Christian who sees Christ triumphant in the world as declared in Scripture. The Manichaean nature of Scofield's view becomes clearer as the idea is given deeper study.
5. BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 54.
6. BeVier, footnote 121.
7. Lindlsey, *op. cit.,* pp. 245, 249.
8. Lindsley and Hill. The entry for Scofield in the work contains 16 errors in the space of two pages. The information was most likely supplied by either Scofield or the church. As already noted, there is no support for the story of birth in Tennessee. All associates of Scofield in the Dispensational movement affirm the Michigan birthplace.
9. BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 52.
10. Record Book, First Church, p. 97.
11. BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 53.
12. *Ibid.*
13. The sermon printed in pamphlet form. Copy in Moodyiana Collection, Moody Bible Institute, Chicago.
14. From the ordination sermon.
15. *Ibid.*
16. Central American Bulletin, September 1921, p. 4.
17. BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 57.
18. Manual of First Congregational Church, pp. 33-50.
19. Note that Dealey Square where President John F. Kennedy was assassinated bears the name of the family.
20. One of the Joneses conveyed 157 Holmes to Scofield.
21. *The Mosher Steel Company, a History of 75 Years,* privately printed, Dallas, 1976.
22. "Pittsburgh Plus" was the system of selling all steel produced in the United States at a price representing the cost at Pittsburgh, plus freight from Pittsburgh to destination. This applied no matter where the steel was produced. This *added* to the cost in many instances and hindered the orderly growth of the steel industry. The practice was finally broken up after World War II. Col. Robert R. McCormick of *The Chicago Tribune* was a leader in the crusade against the practice.

23. *The Purpose of God in This Age,* a sermon preached by C. I. Scofield at First Congregational, Dallas, October 15, 1893, p. 19.
24. *Ibid,* p. 23.
25. *Ibid,* p. 26.
26. *Ibid,* p. 31.
27. *Ibid,* p. 31.
28. *Ibid,* p. 32.
29. BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 57.
30. Scofield letter to Rev. J. B. Clark, March 17, 1893.
31. Record Book, MSS, pp. 117-119.
32. BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 52, Trumbull, p. 52.
33. Insert on p. 163, Record Book, MSS, First Church.
34. BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 52.
35. See *So Much to Learn* by Burnham Carter, Northfield Schools, Northfield, Mass., 1976.
36. Letter from Scofield to Elder Harvey Page, Dec. 26, 1895. Noted by BeVier from the First Church collection.
37. Record Book, First Church, Pastor's Report, 1895.

CHAPTER 23

Under the Elm Trees (Massachusetts)

"Whereunto I am ordained a preacher, and an apostle (I speak the truth in Christ and lie not) a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and verity."

I Tim. 2:7

Northfield, Massachusetts, is a typical New England village with a Main Street shaded with elm trees. There D. L. Moody was born in 1837. He left before the Civil War. As his ministries flourished and his fame grew, he turned back again to Northfield, once again looking on it as home. In the final years of his life, Northfield, rather than Chicago was his base.

Recognizing a need for training Christian leaders, Moody was instrumental in establishing two preparatory schools, with Christian emphasis, in his home community. Northfield Seminary for Girls opened in 1979; Mt. Hermon School of Boys opened in 1881.[1]

The young Moody, the boy from Northfield, came from an environment virtually Unitarian: He was a product of the apostacy which we have noted, spread from Harvard to blight New England, the East, ultimately touching the entire country.[2] But the Moody who returned to Northfield had been converted and gone "all the way" with the Lord. He was instrumental in changing others. By the 1890's the white-steepled church on the Northfield Green could properly be called "Trinitarian Congregational Church." It was the Trinitarian Congregational Church which late in 1895 issued a call to Rev. C. I. Scofield of Dallas to become its pastor. Since the church was Moody's home church, it is generally assumed that Moody was the instigator of the call to Scofield.[3]

Scofield arrived in Northfield at the beginning of 1896. Hettie presumably was with her husband, but we find no reference to her until James M. Gray related an incident which occurred several years later. Noel, who had just turned 7 when the move to Massachusetts took place, is never mentioned.[4]

BeVier notes that there is little record of Scofield's activities during the Northfield period. The records in Dispensational sources seem confusing at first glance. With careful study they begin to sort out—but in a manner which may be upsetting to Dispensationalists.

The dynamism of Mr. Moody led to the starting of varied programs. These offer room for confusion when one must rely on the memories

of elderly men, but all this cannot account for the confusion about Scofield's ministries in his sixth decade. Certain Dispensational and/or Evangelical sources have held that accepting the call to the pulpit at Northfield was automatically and almost by the same act, appointment to the presidency of the two preparatory schools in the town. Really it is quite naive to think that the schools of the calibre of the preparatory schools in Northfield could or would have functioned with an executive head selected by the calling of a pastor to what was essentially a parochial, rural congregation.

Note that besides the preparatory schools, for a number of years, there was a Northfield Bible Training School, also established by D. L. Moody. Moody never liked to see anything wasted, including space.[5] Since there was space in the Northfield Hotel during the winter, he decided to use it for a school which might have grown into a New England "Moody Institute." The school, begun in 1889, functioned during the winters. It drew students entirely separate from and of different age groups than the two preparatory schools. Scofield was on the faculty of the Training School 1896-1898 and letterheads of 1900 and 1902 refer to him as president. Trumbull refers to the Northfield Bible Training School without any specifics. Careless reading may have led some to think that Trumbull referred to the preparatory schools.[6]

The Northfield Bible Training School does not appear to have survived after Scofield's departure from Northfield in 1903. Except for notes in some biographical sketches, we have not found it referred to in other Evangelical or Fundamental publications. Its 1900 letterhead described it as:

> Northfield Training School for Men and Women
> Founded by D. L. Moody

Its 1902 letterhead is that of The Scofield Bible Correspondence Course and identifies Scofield as "President of the Northfield Bible Training School."[7]

The Northfield preparatory schools (Mt. Hermon and Northfield) issued an excellent history of the schools, *So Much To Learn,* written by Burnham Carter and published by the schools in 1976.[8] It has been carefully examined. The name of C. I. Scofield is nowhere found in the book. Dr. Paul Bowman, archivist of the schools, confirms in writing the fact that Scofield was never officially connected with the preparatory schools. The evidence is that his only connection seems to have been to preach to the students on those Sundays when he was in town and when they came to church.

When BeVier was working on his thesis in 1960, he was advised in a letter dated March 14, 1960, from Frank Pearsall, then director of public relations of the schools, as follows:

> Your letter of March 5 seeking information about Dr. Cyrus I. Scofield has been handed to me for attention. I am sorry that there is very little information that we can give you about Dr. Scofield since his primary association while in Northfield was with the Trinitarian Congregational Church rather than with The Northfield Schools. He was also connected with the Northfield Summer Conferences and is listed as a speaker at both the Northfield General Conference and the Northfield Girls' Conference in 1898 and 1900. Incidentally, these dates span the final year of Mr. Moody's life which ended in 1899.[9]

The schools have never been able to authenticate the Dispensationalists, view. A. C. Gaebelein's position on the matter of Scofield and the schools is strange. Writing in *Moody Monthly* in November 1942, he recalled a Sunday, April 19, 1900, when he preached in Scofield's pulpit in East Northfield. But writing in 1942, he repeated the claim that Scofield was president of the two preparatory schools.[10]

Note that in 1900, before the days of the auto and airplane, Gaebelein, coming from New York on the New Haven and Boston and Maine Railroad, could not have been in and out of East Northfield the same day. He must have spent at least one or two nights at the manse. Gaebelein should have noted a bit of Scofield's regular schedule. The fact that he had no office in Camp Hall (the administrative center) on the campus should have registered with Gaebelein.

Rather than "crucify" Gaebelein for inaccuracy, we note that when he wrote for *Moody Monthly,* he was 81 years old.[11] Let Frank Maloy Anderson (History Professor at two Universities), provide an "out" or alibi for an elderly gentleman:

> It has frequently happened that men writing or speaking after a long interval about an important event they had witnessed have fallen into the error of incorporating into their own recollection details about the event which they did not actually see or hear but had derived from the report of some other witness or reputed witness. Memoirs and reminiscences afford numerous examples of such mistakes.[12]

The school matter is not of the historical import of the event that Anderson was discussing, but he does suggest a possible explanation. Gaebelein, not fully trusting an 81-year-old memory, could have utilized stories circulating in the Dispensational community. But where did the stories start? Who kept them going?

In light of the question at hand, it is interesting to reproduce Dr. James M. Gray's remarks on the Northfield period as he supposedly gave them at a 1916 testimonial dinner for Scofield in New York. (The event will be discussed later:)

> On Dr. Scofield's work in Northfield, Mass., there is not time to adequately dwell. But everyone knows it could not have been confined to the pastorate of a country church. What an opportunity was opened there through the hundreds of young lives coming and going every year

> in the Northfield Seminary for Girls and the Mt. Hermon School for boys. How many of these, now influential men and women throughout the world, have daily cause to thank God for his enlightened ministry!
>
> Here Dr. Scofield organized and conducted for a while another school for Christian workers. Here he was one of the stronger attractions of the great summer conferences at that beautiful place, as long as D. L. Moody lived. Here his already extensive oral ministry began greatly to increase throughout the United States and England. In Dallas, his church had provided for an annual absence of five months that he might exercise this ministry, and the Northfield pastorate wisely granted him similar freedom.[13]

We are working with a transcript of Gray's statement, but note that it was not published until nearly five years after it was delivered. The second sentence quoted suggests that even in 1916, there were doubters regarding the factuality of the claim of a role for Scofield as school administrator. If, in the third sentence, Gray is claiming the presidency for Scofield, in the light of official records, such a suggestion is inaccurate. It could have been to convince those who accepted the story, and at the same time assure Northfield alumni and others that knew the facts, that Gray was not departing from the truth. Note also that Gray credits Scofield alone for the Northfield Bible Training School which was actually organized by D. L. Moody and functioning some years before Scofield came to Massachusetts from Dallas.

Interestingly enough, Scofield himself cannot be called upon to support the story circulated by his associates, unless he was agreeable to and cooperated in the weaving of it sometime after the alleged event. Writing January 19, 1903, to A. P. Fitt, Moody's son-in-law, Scofield, discussing a matter related in the next chapter, said; "I have sent in my resignation of the Northfield & Mt. Hermon pastorates."[14] No mention of the schools. Note also, that in 1912, when he supplied information to "Who's Who in America," he listed his Northfield role only as pastor. Scofield himself passed up another opportunity to speak of a school post. Speaking at Moody Bible Institute Founder's Week in Chicago during the early years of the century, he said of the schools:

> I do note institute comparisons between the great work done by the institutions at Northfield when I exalt the Moody Bible Institute—I could not do that. For seven years I was the pastor of those boys and girls, and I love Northfield, and the institutions there.[15]

And in the same message, he made a reference to a school official:

> The principal of Northfield Seminary, Miss Evelyn Hall, is a very great personage in Northfield. I mention her name with reverence and love. She is a remarkable character.[16]

The story of the Presidency may have been created around the time of the 1916 testimonial dinner.

From *So Much to Learn,* we list the officers of the two schools in the "Scofield" period, as taken from official records. This listing is conclusive evidence that the school presidency story is not based on fact.

OFFICERS OF THE SCHOOL FROM THE BEGINNING

Presidents - Mt. Hermon

1881-1893 Hiram Camp
1893-1896 J. M. Harris
1897 no President
1898-1908 Col. J. J. Janeway

Presidents - Northfield

1881-1881 H. M. Moore
1881-1886 D. L. Moody
1886-1891 David M. Weston
1891-1906 H. M. Moore

Headmasters of Mt. Hermon School

Mary L. Hammond 1881-1883
E. A. Hubbard 1883-1884
Henry E. Sawyer 1884-1890
Henry Franklin Cutler 1890-1932

Principals of Northfield School

Harriette W. Tuttle 1879-1882
Emmer Angell Drake 1882-1883
Evelyn S. Hall 1883-1911

[17]

The vacancy noted in the post of corporation president of Mt. Hermon in 1897 does not alter the situation. The corporation functioned during the interregnum without calling on pastor Scofield for help. And note an element of irresponsibility in the Dispensational story; there no distinction is made between the posts of corporation president and that of headmaster charged with the day-to-day running of the schools. A story which sounded good and inflated a man was circulated without checking facts.

The only regular connection Scofield had with the schools were the scheduled Sunday services. The boys from Mt. Hermon Preparatory made the five-mile trek from school to church each Sunday morning and evening on foot. The girls from Northfield Seminary were able to meet the attendance requirement without the lengthy trek.[18]

At the time Scofield arrived in Massachusetts, everything around Northfield was under the shadow of the personality and ideas of D. L. Moody. The shadow loomed larger when he was home from his evangelistic campaigns. For instance, Moody was a strict sabbatarian. The boys were not to study on Sunday. Reading the Sunday paper and bicycle riding were prohibited. Meals for Sunday were prepared on Saturday. Hence, the sermons of Scofield, when he was in town, should have been a big item in the day. The phrase "when in town" was important. At Northfield, Scofield appears to have taken his pastoral duties with about the same level of seriousness as elsewhere. His local charge was always something to be dropped if a broader, more public, opportunity beckoned somewhere else.

As the year 1896 moved on, the congregation in Dallas looked forward to the return of their beloved pastor after his year at East

Northfield. In September, they extended a call for him to return: Included was the offer to support the establishment of a Bible School in Dallas. They offered a salary of $2,400 a year, with two months annual vacation.[19] Scofield first promised to consider the matter. At the end of October, he declined, citing as his principal reason, that the two months absence would not be enough (the wide, wide world was calling). He suggested that they seek another pastor.[20]

Rev. William L. Reed left Dallas as scheduled for the mission field in November 1896.[21] First Church was left pastorless. Meanwhile, W. Irving Carroll became pastor of the associated Grand Avenue Mission, which was then reorganized as the Grand Avenue Church:[22] BeVier feels that there is evidence that individual members of First Church, Dallas, wrote Scofield, requesting that he return. In a telegram sent in November, Scofield again declined the offer from Dallas.[23] The church remained without a pastor until May 1897.

In April of 1897, Scofield received word from St. Louis that Dr. James H. Brookes had passed away. In the June 1897 issue of *The Truth,* a monthly magazine which had been published by Dr. Brookes for over 23 years, Scofield said:

> My own personal obligations to him are beyond words. He sought me in the first days of the Christian life and was my friend and first teacher in the oracles of God.[24]

Later in that year (1897), Brookes' sons published a memorial volume, *James H. Brookes, A Memoir.*[25] The two younger Brookes apparently did not put quite the importance on the relationship between Scofield and Brookes that Scofield and the narrators of the Scofield story did. As we will note in connection with other prominent associates of Scofield, there is no mention of the relationship between the two men. There is no clue in that book as to what actually went on in St. Louis between August 9, 1879, and August 17, 1882. The book does include the following appreciation of Brookes, written by Scofield:

> When the word was brought to me that I should see no more with mortal eyes the face of my beloved friend and teacher, James H. Brookes, I felt that he might well have passed to the presence of his Lord with Paul's great triumph song upon his lips; 'I have fought a good fight; I have finished my course; I have kept the faith.' There was in him the heart of David's mighty men. Like Eleazer, 'his hand clave unto the sword'. The Word of God was ever the end of controversy with him, and also the sword which he valiantly wielded.
>
> Our brother will be remembered as a brave defender of the faith once for all delivered to the saints, but some of us know how tender and how helpful was the great heart now stilled in death. My own personal obligations to him are beyond words. He sought me in the first days of my Christian life, and was my first and best teacher in the oracles of God.[26]

In May 1897, First Church (Dallas) called Frederic A. Hatch as pastor. At that time Scofield transferred his membershp from Dallas to the Trinitarian Congregational Church in East Northfield. Presumably Hettie's membership was similarly transferred.[27]

One other matter must be considered before we discuss the Northfield Bible Conference. The 1897 issue of the conference publication, *Northfield Echoes,* listed Scofield as the Rev. C. I. Scofield. In the 1898 issue, he is shown as Rev. C. I. Scofield, D.D. BeVier, apparently not having noted any previous use of the degree and the title "Dr.", such as the 1892 sermon noted in chapter 22, assumed that it had been awarded during the previous winter. He commented that it is not known what school conferred the degree.[28] No college ever claimed him and we are not aware of any degree-awarding institution which in the 1890's would recognize Dispensational accomplishments.

In the light of the varied items of information uncovered about Scofield's other accomplishments, consider the possibility that NO school ever awarded that degree. This writer feels that it is quite likely that Scofield "conferred" the degree upon himself to add to the prestige of his name.

If this is so, we may be faced with another false statement and a fraudulent claim regarding Scofield's life and history. While weighing the significance of BeVier's comment on the degree, the writer learned that rumors of Scofield's self-awarded degree have been circulating in the Chicago Fundamentalist community for years.[29] In whatever manner Scofield secured the honorary degree, he consistently used it. His associates in the Fundamentalist community, to a great extent, went along.[30] If the degree is false, consider the brazenness of a man who placed a false degree after his name on the title page of an edition of Gold's Holy Word.[31]

The Northfield Summer Conferences, in which Scofield is reported to have had a part, were founded by D. L. Moody back in 1880. For their first 20 years, they revolved around Moody. The purpose, he said, was "not so much to study the Bible (though the Scriptures will be daily searched for instruction and promises) as for solemn self-consecration, to plead God's promises and to wait upon Him for fresh anointing from on high."[32]

In the purpose announced for Northfield, Moody had a vision many cuts above that of the "balmy" Niagara Conference and the later Sea Cliff sessions. As with so much else in Fundamentalism, the conference phenomenon generated its own jargon. Because of the geographic locations usually selected for the Conferences, the term "mountain top blessings" was and is frequently used to describe the conference experience. And in 1896 and for several years thereafter, Scofield helped to make that possible.

Burham Carter, in *So Much to Learn,* related he story of the conferences. It describes some of the environment in which Scofield worked:

> THE NORTHFIELD SUMMER CONFERENCES
>
> For more than seventy-five years the Schools conducted religious conferences in the summer which made Northfield famous around the world.
>
> Dwight L. Moody founded them in 1880. The purpose, as he said, was "not so much to study the Bible (though the Scriptures will daily be searched for instruction and promises) as for solemn self-consecration, to plead God's promises, and wait upon Him for fresh anointing power from on high."
>
> The first conference was called the "Convocation for Prayer." It lasted ten days and was attended by 350 people. The second, in 1881, lasted the full month of August and drew 900 people. Since Mr. Moody didn't like to see any of his beautiful new Seminary buildings wasted, other conferences were added, to make a tightly-planned eight weeks every summer.
>
> * * *
>
> During their first twenty years the conferences revolved around D. L. Moody. His star-studded roster of speakers attracted a large following, but, in the final analysis, it was Mr. Moody's sense of timing and drama that kept the crowds spellbound. Within a short time Northfield had come to occupy a place of such importance in American religious life that many leading newspapers, including the Boston Transcript, sent staff reporters to the meetings, and the Postal Telegraph Company ran its wires to the campus to provide service for newsmen.[33]

Both speakers and conference-goers came from all over the world. During Scofield's time at Northfield, Robert Scott of the British publishing house of Morgan and Scott attended. Morgan and Scott were linked with the Plymouth Brethren. As Robert Scott is introduced into the story, it seems Scofield had not met him at the time he is said to have first visited England. The acquaintance was to play a crucial role in the next stage of Scofield's life and ministry.

In the 1898 conference season, the World's Student Conference, sponsored by the World Student Christian Federation, was held at Northfield. The World Student Christian Federation was a student branch of the YMCA and YWCA.[34] In 1898, its national secretary was John R. Mott, of international fame in the soon-to-be-blossoming and burgeoning ecumenical movement. Mott's flexible orthodoxy helped to direct denominational mission boards into unbelief and denial of basic Christian truths. Scofield's ideas of separation were often hazy and expeditious.

During 1899, Henry M. Moore of Boston and Rev. F. B. Meyer, well-known English evangelist, raised $53,000 to be presented to Moody for his 60th birthday. The gift was to be used for a chapel on the campus. Writing of the gift, his son, W. R. Moody said:

> When the fund was presented to him for this purpose, he was deeply touched by the generous tribute, but it was characteristic of him that he would not allow his name to appear anywhere on the building. A bronze tablet in the vestry shows only that it is given by "Friends in England and America to the Glory of God."[35]

Moody, rejecting original plans, had the chapel built to seat 1,000: Local granite from a Northfield quarry, which Moody had reopened, was used in construction. The chapel was completed in 1899, just a few weeks before Moody died. At the suggestion of Henry F. Cutler, the chapel was organized as a regular church. The work of organization was undertaken in September 1899 by a committee of five men, including Cutler and Mr. James McConaughy.

McConaughy had come to Mt. Hermon in September 1891 at the invitation of D. L. Moody. *So Much To Learn,* already referred to, and a pamphlet, *The Mount Hermon Church* 1899-1939, written by Samuel Stark, give the story of the church and McConaughy's role.[36] The stories suggest that McConaughy actually carried out many of the things which the Dispensational movement has credited to Scofield.

The church was organized November 11, 1899, and held its first service the following Sunday. Stark's pamphlet notes regarding Scofield:

> Dr. Cyrus I. Scofield was at this time the pastor of the Trinitarian Congregational Church in Northfield. During the years preceding, the Hermon boys had attended this church Sunday mornings, making the long trek over and back, since it was Mr. Moody's direction, without undue remonstrance. Many of the charter members of the new church at Mount Hermon had taken their letters from Northfield. So it seemed entirely natural that Dr. Scofield should become the charter pastor at Hermon. Dr. Scofield graciously accepted the invitation, and in his annual report to the church at Northfield, January, 1900, we find the following entry—in characteristic style.
>
> "One marked event of the year (1899) was the foundation of the Union Church at Mount Hermon by a colony who, for that laudable purpose, withdrew from our membership. In a very real sense we may, therefore, claim a maternal relation to that vigorous young church."
>
> Dr. Scofield undertook to preach at Mount Hermon one Sunday every month. This service was much interrupted by many obligations, but the very rarity of its rendering made it notable and distinguished. Dr. Scofield spent his earlier years in the practice of the law; he was a student of the Bible very acute and profound; his very eloquent speech and his very dignified presence made his ministry unique and his influence far-reaching.
>
> Dr. Scofield, however, remained at Northfield only three more years, and withdrawal from the one pastorate necessitated withdrawal from the other. While Dr. Scofield's powerful preaching was ever regarded as a remarkable Christian privilege, under the circumstances of remote residence and many other duties, the pastoral function was more or less held in abeyance. It will not be too much to say that during this period Mr. McConaughy was the virtual acting pastor.[36]

The pamphlet credits McConaughy with carrying out the responsibility for pastoral care of the flock. Such things did not, as seen from this distance, appear to weigh heavily on Scofield.

The organization of the Mt. Hermon Church was overshadowed by the death of D. L. Moody at the very end of 1899. Scofield preached the funeral sermon for Moody, and thus his name was carried in newspapers around the world. Clipping services for notables, or for those who could pay, were unknown in 1899. Thus Scofield may not have been aware of the story published in *The Kansas City Journal* in its issue of Tuesday, December 28, 1899, inspired by the report of the funeral sermon. The report unfortunately linked Scofield's role with Moody and his shady past in Kansas. Of great interest was the statement in the article:

> When approached by his Kansas creditors Parson Scofield declares that he is poor and unable to pay, but he has never failed to do the right and easy thing by renewing his notes.[37]

As suggested elsewhere, genuineness in conversion and the accompanying change of heart include restitution. Such was an absolute condition in the Old Dispensation.

The making of notes to cover debts incurred by criminal activities is another Scofield inexplicability. (He had demonstrated very flexible ideas about the integrity of notes, anyway.) By 1899, the obligations incurred by crimes of 1873 had gone beyond the statute of limitations. Thus his tolling of the statute by issues, then extending notes is unusual. And we may infer that Emeline had felt that the Kansas debts were either not her concern or beyond her ability to handle.

In his comment on Solzhenitsyn's Harvard Address, Harold J. Berman of the Harvard Law School says:

> And many people would say they are entirely justified morally in not paying a debt after the legal time-period has passed within which a claim must be made. Here we are indeed guilty of confusing legality with morality.[38]

But Scofield, with an easy, sleezy option of allowing the statute of limitations to protect him, tolled out that protection. He still refused his legally incurred obligation. Berman's statement shows us that Scofield's position was neither legal or moral. This from a "Man of God."

The Kansas City article generated never a ripple in the Dispensational community. But, of course, many of them read the news with J. N. Darby's view of Matthew 24 as a conditioner. Thus they were blinded to their everyday world.

Scofield continued ministering at Northfield after Moody's death, but the impression prevails that with Moody gone, he was at loose ends. During one of his peripatetic movements, sometime after the

middle of 1900, Scofield met A. C. Gaebelein in New York. Among other things they discussed the discontinuance of the Niagara Bible Conference. Gaebelein says that Scofield proposed another conference early in 1901 in Boston.[39]

Arrangements were made to use the Lecture Room in Park Street Church (the famous "Brimstone Corner"). It repeated the themes of a failing, irrelevant church and a hopelessly decaying world.[40] An offshoot of the conference was a series of monthly meetings for Bible study, conducted by Gaebelein. These continued for 32 years, never once interrupted by The Rapture.

During the Boston Conference, Scofield, Francis Fitch of New York and Alwyn Ball, Jr., a real estate man (from either New York or St. Louis depending on which source you use),[41] and Gaebelein discussed again the breakup of the Niagara Conference. They laid plans which developed into the Sea Cliff Conference to be discussed in the following chapter.

The young 20th Century opened new vistas. With that new century, Scofield was prepared to move on to a new and greater role.

CHAPTER 23 NOTES

1. See *So Much To Learn,* Burnham Carter, 1976.
2. See previous references to *The Leaven of the Sadduccees* by Ernest *Gordon.*
3. See chapter 22.
4. See chapter 24 for reference to Hettie, made when Gray spoke at the 1916 testimonial dinner to Scofield.
5. Letter to the writer from Burnham Carter, December 10, 1977.
6. Trumbull, *op. cit.,* p. 53. In his narration, he makes no mention of the preparatory schools.
7. Letters: Scofield to Mrs. A. P. Fitt (1900) and to A. P. Fitt (1902). Originals in Moodyiana Collection, *Moody* Bible Institute, Chicago.
8. Published by the schools as an Anniversary Issue.
9. Letter Frank W. Pearsall to William BeVier, March 14, 1960.
10. Gaebelein, Moody Monthly, November 1942, p. 135.
11. Born 1861, died 1945, "Who's Who in America."
12. Anderson, Frank Maloy, *op. cit.,* p. 109-110.
13. *Moody Bible Institute Monthly,* September 1921, p. 551.
14. Letter C. I. Scofield *to A. P. Fitt, January 19, 1903. Original in Moodyiana Collection,* Moody Bible Institute, Chicago.
15. Moody Bible Institute Monthly, February 1922, p. 799 ff. The message is not dated, the caption "some years ago." The quote is from p. 799 of the magazine.
16. *Ibid.,* p. 800.
17. *So Much To Learn,* Appendix 1, p. 262, 263.
18. *So Much To Learn,* p. 85.
19. Record Book, First Church, p. 152.
20. BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 62.
21. *Ibid.*
22. Record Book, First Church, p. 152.
23. Church Register, First Church, December 16, 1896.
24. *The Truth,* St. Louis, Mo., Charles B. *Cox,* Publisher, Vol. XXIII, No. 6, 1890.

25. *James H. Brookes, A Memoir,* Presbyterian Publishing Co., 1897. Both this writer and Ernest Sandeen used the copy in the Library of Moody Bible Institute, Chicago. That copy was still in the collection when this writer began his research in the 1970s. It is no longer there. Another copy has not been located at this writing.
26. *Ibid.*
27. Church Register, First Church, p. 26.
28. BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 66. He refers to *Northfield Echoes,* East Northfield, Mass., issued of 1897 and 1898. He compares Vol. IV, p. 777, with Vol. V, p. 25.
29. This writer has often heard George Hilton, railroad historian, state that the best way to obtain missing data on a particular railroad was to publish a book. The next mail invariably brings the missing material. This could happen in the matter of the Scofield degree. It is hoped that Dispensational zeal will not result in a posthumous back-dated awarding of the degree.
30. It should be noted that the degree Doctor of Divinity is purely honorary and not given in recognition of serious work. Properly, it should not give the recipient the right to be addressed as "Doctor" in ordinary usage. The British do better than Americans on that point.
31. Note that many people failed to use "Doctor" in addressing and referring to Scofield. See *Central American Bulletin,* November 1921, where Luther Rees used "Mr." consistently. This writer *found* people in official capacities in Dispensational schools who used "Mr." today.
32. *So Much to Learn,* p. 136.
33. *Ibid.*
34. *Northfield Echoes,* 1898, Vol. V, p. 25ff and 99ff.
35. *So Much To Learn,* p. 92-93.
36. Privately printed, Northfield, Mass., 1939.
37. *The Kansas City Journal,* Kansas City, Mo., Thursday, Dec. 28, 1899, p. 4.
38. Harold J. Berman, "*The Weightier Matters of The Law*" in"Solzhenitsyn at Harvard", edited by Ronald Berman, Ethics and Public Policy Center, Washington, D. C., p. 100.
39. *Moody Monthly,* Feb. 1943, p. 277.
40. *Ibid.*
41. *Moody Monthly,* Feb. 1943, p. 278.

CHAPTER 24

"Dr." Scofield and Mr. Moody

> *"A man that hath friends must shew himself friendly: and there is a friend that sticketh closer than a brother."*
>
> Prov. 18:24

The two previous studies about Scofield, frequently referred to, imply an intimate and continuing relationship between "Dr." Scofield and Mr. Moody: Those who have written about Moody since 1920 (when Trumbull's book came out) have accepted the relationship as portrayed in Trumbull. But such a position is assumed without specific support.

With but one exception, the only appearance of Scofield's name in writing about Moody which came out between 1900 and 1920 was the note that Scofield was pastor in Northfield and conducted the funeral service for Moody. Beyond that appearance, the near-contemporaries seem to have found little that was common knowledge to link the two men as Trumbull did.

The one exception is a product of the efforts of Moody's son, Paul Dwight Moody and his son-in-law Arthur Percy Fitt: It came out in 1900, put together and printed while Moody's memory was still fresh in the minds of the faithful. Originally it was known as *The Shorter Life of D. L. Moody:* Volume 1, *His Life,* and Volume 2, *His Work*. The American Edition was issued by the Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago Moody Bible Institute). The two volumes were published as one in England with an Introduction by F. B. Meyer, put out, not surprisingly, by Marshall and Morgan, London. Over the years, Volume 2 of the American Edition appears to have fallen by the wayside. Volume 1, now titled *The Life of D. L. Moody,* has remained on the list of Moody Press. Paul Moody's name has been deleted from the title page as coauthor (Paul is reported to have gone "liberal" during the 1920's). We can find no change in the text of the current edition.[1]

It is Volume 1 which is of interest here. Of the original 25 chapters, 24 relate to Moody's life from Northfield to Northfield, 1837 to 1899, from farm house to cemetery. It is not a study in depth, but facts are correct and value-judgments appear in line. But right in the middle is a short essay, identified as chapter XVI, bearing the caption "D. L. Moody as an Evangelist: His Characteristics and Methods," by C. I. Scofield, D.D. The four and one-half pages are not a tribute written by a man affected by the departure of a friend. It is simply a comment on Moody as an evangelist with a description of his methods of conducting

his meetings. Much of it is based on Moody's great British campaigns of the 1870's, when Scofield was either chasing Indians on the prairie in Kansas, or else being chased as he tried to avoid prosecution. Scofield's "tribute" was thus based on reports of other men. It cannot be used to affirm (or deny) any level of intimacy between the two men.

What Scofield wrote was an essay which attempted to establish the pattern of Moody as the current definition of evangelism and to suggest that Moody's greatness was to be measured outside the Kingdom of God:

> It is the mark of weak men that they break down under unusual responsibilities, of strong men that they are developed by them. The two Americans who in our generation had most in common, Lincoln and Grant, both came to the maturity of their powers under the pressure of immense labors and responsibilities. Both began with a modest estimate of their capacities; both came at last to a singalarly humble self-confidence. So it may be said that under the testings of his great English campaign Mr. Moody came to the maturity of his powers.[2]

Later, when Scofield related his story to Trumbull, he made this evaluation of Moody:

> Moody was one of the greatest men of his generation. I have sometimes thought that Dwight Moody and General Grant were by any true definition of greatness the greatest men I have ever met.[2]

The comparison with Grant is most interesting, but possibly quite unoriginal. Contemporary newspaper men reporting Moody campaigns made the comparison first. Both men were heavy-set and bearded. Since Scofield had usually promoted Confederate associations (Lee and all that) in building his image, we consider the Grant comparison as more evidence of the eclectic unoriginal thought pattern of Scofield.

The trip to Washington in the Summer of 1873 may have been the only time Scofield saw Grant. (Scofield "admitted" to missing him by 12 miles on April 9, 1865.)[4] But to link Grant with Moody, we feel is somewhat improper to anyone perceptive. Moody wanted to be fully used of God and was so used. Grant, the Grant who Scofield met, was utterly complacent about the rank corruption in his Administration.[5] He died horribly of cancer because he could not or would not master his appetite for cigars. (We admit Grant's greatness as general—see the works of Lloyd Lewis and Bruce Catton.) The comparison is not odious but it suggests some lack of judgment. As recorded in Trumbull, it may be just the stock sort of statement which Scofield remembered and brought out as needed. We suggest that bringing Lincoln into the story by an unrepentant Confederate is an attempt to keep discussion on the level of the daily newspaper and to utilize the political world when it suited.

In a Founder's Week Message, given at Moody Institute some years before Scofield narrated to Trumbull, he made a different statement about Moody's greatness which seems of the same genre:

> I think Henry Drummond said the great word about Mr. Moody the man. He said that he was the greatest human he ever knew. Carlyle says that the great man is the man who can conceive great things and do them. If that be a true definition of human greatness, Mr. Moody was a great man.[6]

The Henry Drummond referred to was the Scottish semi-liberal who Scofield was later to condemn strongly.[7] Carlyle's Christian faith is reported to have been destroyed through the instrumentality of his friend, Edward Irving. Scofield's comparisons often made good oratory, but accuracy is another matter.

The present research suggests that Scofield's Northfield ministry, starting at the beginning of 1896, was the only time when the two men could have had much opportunity for intimate personal relationship. Even in those four short years, both men did quite a bit of traveling.

Certain comparisons between Moody and Scofield make us wonder whether the two were so oriented that they could have had a real basis for fellowship. The contrasts are sharply delineated: Moody refused formal ordination; Scofield sought and readily accepted ordination. (But he may have engaged in deception to secure it.) Moody was always "Mr. Moody"; Scofield early identified himself as "Dr. Scofield" and added a degree of "D.D." Evidence suggests that the title was incorrect, the degree self-bestowed. Moody accepted the fact that his formal schooling was limited and allowed the Lord to use him as he was; Scofield made a number of passes at claiming additional schooling which in fact he never had. Moody's relationship with Emma was unblemished; Scofield's marital tangles involving Leontime and Hettie cannot be fitted into a valid Evangelical pattern. Was there any basis for real rapport?

The two first met in St. Louis during Moody's evangelistic campaign, which ran from late November 1879 until April 1880. Scofield at that time had just slithered out of his liability for forgery. Scofield himself related this incident involving Moody, suggesting that it occurred near the beginning of their acquaintance:

> I happened to go into Dr. Goodell's study one morning. I found Mr. Moody seated there, waiting for him. I had met him in the after-meeting, and he remember me. He said "I am waiting for Dr. Goodell: he is the Barnabas here, he is the son of consolation. . . .[8]

The incident is not datable exactly. But the friendship between Scofield and Moody must have developed only as the campaign progressed. Scofield by his own admission was virtually ignorant of the Bible and

matters spiritual when the campaign opened.[9] He did learn, and possibly faster than many, but what basis for intimacy was there even when Moody left St. Louis at the end of the campaign in April?

Observers have reported that Moody's personality and presence were so dynamic that they could not fail to receive a terrific impact just being in Moody's presence. Typical is the oft-related story of Woodrow Wilson in a barber shop:

> I was in a barber shop, sitting in a chair, when I became aware that a personality had entered the room. A man had come quitely in upon the same errand as myself and sat in the chair next to me. Every word he uttered, though it was not in the least didactic, showed a personal and vital interest in the man who was serving him; and before I got through with what was being done to me, I was aware that I had attended an evangelistic service, because Mr. Moody was in the next chair. I purposely lingered in the room after he left and noted the singular effect his visit had upon the barbers in that shop. They talked in undertones. They did not know his name, but they knew that something had elevated their thought. And I felt that I left that place as I should have left a place of worship.[10]

This was the impact of a man Scofield claimed to be initimate with. But how could the Scofield unconcerned about theft, unconcerned about family neglect, have a reaction in any way as moving as that of Woodrow Wilson or the barbers in the shop? How could he be intimate with the dynamic commitment to God which was D. L. Moody? Could it be that Scofield was playing a role? A role that covered a reality indifferent to truths that motivated Moody? That role would have to be utterly devoid of conscience, have complete moral relativity *(The Atchison Patriot* story allows for this possibility). The phenomenon is only one of the unexplained elements in the history of Fundamentalism. (The quote from Ernest Sandeen used elsewhere could probably be enlarged to include Fundamentalism as well as Brethrenism.)[11]

We do know that one outcome of the Scofield-Moody Campaign of 1879-1880 was that Scofield picked up the special jargon which is the hallmark of Dispensationalism (see Sydney Harris' column on special language).[12] He picked it up so well that he became a proficient and convincing speaker. But did he convince himself? Did Moody have a chance to pierce that most convincing front which the Rev. C. I. Scofield had? And what did the real Scofield actually think of the dynamo from Northfield, either in campaigns or when the two men were neighbors?

The next recorded contact between the two men was a three day evangelistic campaign in Dallas in March 1886.[13] The schedule of meetings hardly allowed much time for intimate fellowship. Already noted are reports that Scofield was on the program at the Northfield Bible Conference even before the move to Northfield. But we do not note publication of any Scofield messages before the 1895 season. How did

Moody decide that Scofield would fit on the conference schedule? Or did someone else select Scofield for a program spot?

There was nothing unusual in Moody's return to Dallas in 1895 for an evangelistic campaign.[14] But shortly after the campaign ended, a call came to Scofield from the church in East Northfield. Narrators of the Scofield story have credited Moody with the instigation of the call. But, like so much else in the Scofield story, this may not be so. Our research suggests that the idea appeared in Moody stories only after it had been circulated during the build-up of the Scofield image.

We have found nothing attributed to Moody which supports Scofield's claim. Even James M. Gray, (the well-groomed little man in the grey fedora)[15] at the 1916 "wing-ding," failed to credit Moody with the origination of the Northfield move.

In that light it is interesting to note a reference which Samuel Stark put in the Mt. Hermon Church pamphlet about James McConaughy:

> Mr. McConaughy was peculiarly fitted for this new task. He had been an Association secretary for many years and had been remarkably successful in his Christian work with young men. At the invitation of Mr. Moody, in September, 1891, he had come to Mount Hermon to carry on this work in the form of Bible teaching. He enjoyed initimate personal friendship with Mr. Moody and was perfectly sympathetic.[16]

As stark describes McConaughy, he appears to have had most of the assets, the talents which both Scofield and Trumbull attributed to the Tennessean from Michigan. So why Scofield?

Richard Ellsworth Day in his centennial biography of Moody *"Bush Aglow,"* notes that Moody was much affected by the death of Charles H. Spurgeon in 1891.[17] There are suggestions that Moody had been more influenced by Spurgeon, and Spurgeon's theology than is generally realized.

Moody was theologically unlearned although spiritually acute. In the late 1860's, the Plymouth Brethren had made a special effort to recruit Moody to the Failing Church Eschatology of that sect, a philosophy now marketed as Dispensationalism. Of course, the system has its logic and can seem impressive when vigorously pursued. The trips of Moody to England and the meetings with Spurgeon seem to have unsettled some of the Brethren work. But note that Spurgeon and the Brethren are twain that could never meet.

In his modern biography, J. C. Pollock collected a series of quotes which are an apt summary of Moody's views:

> Moody's theological views were, in Speer's words, "the simple central convictions of the evangelical tradition, the Wesleyan evantelistic warmth appealing to human freedom, and the sinews of the Calvinistic reverence for God and His will which Moody felt and knew as a will of love"—a

> Biblical theology. As put by Dr. James M. Gray of the Bible Institute, Torrey's future successor, "The brain of his theology was the grip he had on the authority and integrity of the Bible as the Word of God." Sankey gave as one of the reasons for Moody's phenomenal success "that he believed absolutely, implicitly in the message he gave to men. . . . No doubts ever dimmed his faith in the Word of God. To him it was the truth, and the whole truth." "To the Bible he went continually with the spirit of a little child," Dr. Weston wrote. When he preached he held his Bible in his hand through much of the sermon, "often adjusting his glasses to read in a manner that made very hearer feel 'these are the oracles of the living God.' "[10]

In those remembrances of Moody, we see a view which was not the rigid Brethren "doom-hope." Instead of being a precursor of Hal Lindsey, he held views which could be comfortable with Spurgeon's.

The consequences of Moody obviously straying from the Brethren "party-line" on prophecy would have been horrendous to the Dispensational hierarchy whose overt representative was A. C. Gaebelein. It just could not be allowed to happen. We probably will never be able to find a full explanation for the Scofield move from Dallas to Northfield. Remember that Moody had to be kept on the "party-line." That being so, Scofield could have been assigned the task of keeping Moody in the proper prophetic framework.

Gaebelein in 1941 told of an incident which he implies came from Scofield:

> Moody himself needed at that time a better knowledge of prophecy, and Scofield was the man to lead him into it. Scofield told us that after he had assumed the pastorate in East Northfield he heard Moody preach a sermon on the life of Paul. Moody described at the close of his sermon how finally Paul died the martyr's death. The executioner came to his cell, and willingly the great man of God put his head upon the executioner's block. One powerful stroke and the head rolled off. But in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, Paul found himself in heaven. The Lord met him and put a glittering crown of gold upon his head, which Paul has been wearing ever since.
>
> "I felt," said Scofield, "that I must set him right on this. So when the proper opportunity came, I asked Mr. Moody a few simple questions."
>
> "Mr. Moody, please tell me how could the Lord put a glittering crown upon the head of the apostle when he had no head at all? The head of Paul was in the Roman prison. The body of the apostle was buried; only his spiritual part appeared in the presence of the Lord. Paul was absent from the body and present with the Lord."
>
> Mr. Moody declared that he had never thought of that.
>
> "And so I asked Mr. Moody to take his Bible. We read together II Timothy 4:6–8. I explained to him the coming of the Lord, that it will mean the resurrection of the righteous dead, and that only then, when I Thessalonians 4:16-18 is fulfilled, will Paul receive a body like unto the glorious body of Christ Himself and receive his crown."
>
> These remarks brought blessing to Mr. Moody and led to a better knowledge of prophecy.[19]

In the relation we see the essentially immature literalness of the Brethren, trying to define heaven in terms of the material earth. In the light of what has been related so far, can anyone be happy about Scofield instructing Moody in anything? While the incident related by Gaebelein does not have much "prophetic light," Gaebelein's opening statement: "Moody himself needed at that time a better knowledge of prophecy, and Scofield was the man to lead him into it" is pregnant with intimations (what had happened to the prophetic instruction of the late 1860's? Didn't it "take"?).

It may be the clue to the Northfield period and at the same time Dispensational double-talk. In chapter 21, we noted how limited Scofield's role was in the prophetic conferences. He apparently could not compete with the experts who held those platforms. And we will see that as late as 1905, in a letter written from The Lotos Club, New York City, he deferred to Gaebelein on the prophetic material for the Magnum Opus. The official explanation for Scofield in Northfield just does not fit.

The two men could not have been together constantly. In that undated Founder's Week message, Scofield noted:

> We used to long for Spring to come around, not only because it brought the flowers, and the green came out on those matchless hills, and carpeted that unrivaled valley, but because it was the time when Mr. Moody came back from his winter's evangelistic work.[20]

And as Scofield accoladed Moody, he let oratory carry him into "mush." Speaking of Moody, he said; "He was a great human. I like to emphasize that word 'human.' " A few heartbeats later, he said: "Mr. Moody was the greatest 'human' Drummond ever saw, and Drummond lived in a country where there were a great many human people, and he was a very human man himself."[20] (Speaking here, of course, of Professor Drummond, not Banker Drummond.) All that reminds one of a review in *The New York Times Book Review* when John Steinbeck's *Cannery Row* first came out. Steinbeck had justified his story of pimps, perverts and prostitutes claiming that his creations were "real people." The reviewer, with justified contempt which would not today be allowed in *The New York Times,* said,"I know how to find real people, stick a pin in. If it draws blood, they are real." A similar comment would be appropriate for Scofield's gush over the word "human."

A vignette from Scofield shows the midseason closeness of the two men, but carries a hint that Moody was retaining the leadership:

> It was a great event when Mr. Moody came back. He used to doff his preaching clothes, and get into the strangest garments! Wherever he got some of the clothes he used to wear around Northfield nobody ever knew. He used to get into his buggy, with his little daughter or granddaughter by his side, and he would pass my parsonage at the unholy hour of five in the morning, and call out,"Scofield, you had better get up![21]

Scofield told of the relationship between Moody and Emma:

> I cannot speak of many things, but I wish I could tell you—it is almost *too* sacred to talk of—about the beautiful home life of Mr. Moody. No one who ever knew them can think of Mr. and Mrs. Moody apart; *no* one can think of one without thinking of the other, so much was that beautiful character, the very type of high, refined and devoted wifehood and womanhood, a part of her great husband, and so comically did that strong man lean on her for help and wisdom.[21]

The ability to glibly relate the story of Dwight and Emma, with no apparent evidence of any twinge of conscience about his own situation and his treatment of wives again suggests that the man was capable of saying what the occasion called for without concern. And he had most certainly not made the slightest attempt to lay any foundation for a relationship with Leontine such as he described for the Moodys. We rely on *The Atchison Patriot* reporter for confirmation.

Moody must have felt that there were times when Scofield had to be considered. James M. Gray reports an incident which appears to have taken place during the 1898 Northfield Conference. The incident was another one related during that dinner in New York in 1916:

> But the first time I really came to know him had a touch of humor to it. It was at a summer Bible conference at Northfield, where he was then paster of the church of which D. L. Moody was a member.
>
> Devoted brethren were present at the conference and were discussing the conducting of it, which was not entirely to their liking. "hey felt, justly or unjustly, that Mr. Moody himself was to blame for it. And one day they held a prayer-meeting about it in the woods, at the close of which it was determined that one of them should present their complaint and criticism to Mr. Moody personally. But who should be the one?
>
> "Wrens make prey where eagles dare not perch," and so the older and wiser men held back, for D. L. Moody was not to be trifled with. No one volunteered, until at length the youngest and silliest of the group offered himself for the sacrifice.
>
> Bearding the lion in his den, in other words, waylaying Mr. Moody, as he was leaving the auditorium, I told him what was thought of him, expecting to get my walking papers on the spot. However, when I finished, he thought a moment and then simply said:
>
> "Is that what the old guard think of me?"
>
> "Yes," I answered.
>
> Whereupon he added, "Call them together in my library at three o'clock this afternoon, will you?"
>
> I said I would, and immediately started for Dr. Scofield's parsonage, feeling that he was the only man who could adequately handle the situation for the complainants.
>
> But the defendant got ahead of me. I missed no time, it seemed to me, but Mr. Moody must have run; for when I rang Dr. Scofield's doorbell"

Mrs. Scofield (Hettie) answered the door and told Gray that he would have to wait, for her husband had Mr. Moody closeted with him in his study!

> Not to prolong the harrowing tale, the "old guard" did not win their case. I think Dr. Scofield, in his tactful way, helped them to feel that they had gotten *something* out of it, "a leg or a piece of an ear," as Amos said of Israel. Theirs was not entirely a lost cause in other words, but Mr. Moody erred not in confiding his interests to his pastor's hands. Indeed his love and veneration for Dr. Scofield never wanted, and it was a kindly providence that permitted the latter to say the farewell words as the snow-clad earth covered all that was mortal of that great man.[22]

But with all this, we cannot be sure that Scofield really got the best of Moody's independent thinking. Moody's son, Will, who was as remote from Dispensationalism as anyone in Northfield, when writing about his father, included this letter of 1898, written in answer to an invitation from Australia:

> The work in my own country has never been so promising as it is now. Destructive theology on the one side, and the no less evil spirit of extreme intolerance on the other side, have wrought wide dissension in many communities in America. Instead of fighting error by the emphasis of truth, there has been too much "splitting of hairs" and only too often an unchristian spirit of bitterness. This has frequently resulted in depleted churches, and has opened the way for the entrance of still greater errors. Under these conditions the question of the authorship of the individual books of the Bible has become of less immediate importance than a knowledge of the teaching of the Bible itself the question of the two Isaiahs less urgent than a familiarity with the prophecy itself.[23]

The letter does not appear to have been noted by other biographers. The opening sentence quoted would send shudders up and down the spine of a Brethren or of a devotee of a "balmy" Bible conference like Niagara. The letter describes conditions of bitterness for which the Brethren were notorious, especially in the 19th Century.

Scofield was a few years later to imply a real lack of rapport between the two men. In a letter of July 1, 1905, written to A. P. Fitt, Moody's son-in-law, Scofield said:

> Year by year the greatness and goodness of Mr. Moody grew upon me, & I find it one of my anticipations of heaven that there—past all misunderstandings—I shall renew my fellowship with him.[24]

Someone, Fitt or a curator of the Moodyiana Collection, has both underlined and marked with a "star" the phrase "past all misunderstandings." This letter is the only documentation noting a difference between the two men. But careful review of the Northfield material suggests underlying hints.

While the schools may have taken no notice of "Dr." Scofield, except on Sunday morning and evening, they were always aware of Mr. Moody. In *So Much to Learn* there is this note, evidently based on common knowledge and valid tradition carried down to the present time:

> The years were winding down for Mr. Moody, not because he was old—he was only sixty in 1897—but because he had poured his extraordinary energy into his causes without stint and because he had let himself become too heavy, by over-eating and failing to exercise.[25]

Remember, and this point is found even in elementary psychology texts, overeating can sometimes be a reaction to pressure. Such pressure may be what was referred to in the 1905 letter. Whatever, Moody had not much longer to live. In fact, he did not live long enough to be completely taken into the Dispensational inner party circle.

The story of the end of D. L. Moody, as far as this earth is concerned, is related from a combination of sources; *So Much to Learn,* a report in the magazine *The Christian,* issue of Jan. 11, 1900 (p. 24, 25), Scofield's own program for the service and even a comment by Scofield:

> In Kansas City, the great auditorium held 15,000 people, and thousands more were unable to get inside for Moody's meetings. Once every night and once every day for five days Moody spoke to them. After the first day he could not walk; he was carried to the platform. Once there he was able to stand for an hour for the service. By Friday he was so weak he called a doctor, who told him he must terminate his mission at once.[26]

Scofield related:

> When I saw him in his carriage come up from the station, and cross the little bridge over the beautiful brook at Northfield, when I looked into his face, and he raised his hand as he recognized me, I could not believe that Dwight L. Moody had come home to die. Until the very last I could not believe it.[27]

We continue from *So Much to Learn:*

> He returned to Northfield to stay in bed in his house. At 3:00 on his last morning, December 22, 1899, W. R. Moody, his son, took his turn as watcher in the sickchamber. Moody fell asleep, and woke after about an hour, speaking in slow and measured words:
>
> "Earth recedes. Heaven opens before me."
>
> His son thought he was dreaming and tried to rouse him.
>
> "No, this is no dream, Will," he said. "It is beautiful! If this is death, it is sweet. God is calling me, and I must go."
>
> He told Will that he should continue to work for Mount Hermon; Paul the younger brother who was still in college would supervise the Northfield Seminary; the nephew Ambert would help with the general management; and Moody's son-in-law A. P. Fitt would look after the Bible Institute in Chicago.
>
> He sank again into a coma and again emerged, exclaiming: "This is a strange thing! I've been beyond the gates of death to the very portals of Heaven and here I am back again. It is very strange." He was excited and happy, and a few hours later he died.[28]

The Christian, issue of January 11, 1900, notes regarding the services of December 26, 1899:

> At 10 o'clock there was a brief service at the house, conducted by Dr. C. I. Scofield, pastor of the Congregational Church. . . .[29]

From Carter:

> On the day after Christmas, thirty-two Mount Hermon boys carried Dwight L. Moody in his simple coffin half a mile from the Homestead to the Congregational Church in town.[30]

Again from *The Christian:*

> At 2:00 PM, the Church was filled for services shared in by Geo. Stebbins, D. L. Towner, F. H. Jacobs, close associates of Moody in his work, Dr. Scofield, Dr. Arthur T. Pierson and Rev. George C. Needham.[31]

Again, from Carter:

> After the service they carried him to Round Top where he was buried and where his wife would be interred later. Round Top is a landmark on the Northfield campus and looks across the Connecticut River to the western hills.

At the Round Top, a short service proceeded the lowering of the casket.[32] Carter continues:

> Everyone knew that Dwight L. Moody's death marked the end of an era; for while Moody had never been active in the administration of the schools, he was always *there*—within reach—offering an unfailing spring of faith.[33]

We can never be really sure what Scofield thought of Moody. The Founder's Day accolade which appeared in *Moody Monthly* in 1922 sounds extremely legitimate and most wonderful.

In 1909, two Dallas lawyers were writing a history of the city. L. B. Hill undertook a sketch of short biographies of leading Dallas figures. The sketch on C. I. Scofield, to be considered in due course, is appropriate to concluding the chapter on Scofield and Moody. Note the following, which Trumbull apparently never saw.

> Having formed a strong personal attachment to the late Dwight L. Moody, of Northfield, Massachusetts, Dr. Scofield went to that city and became president of the Northfield Bible School and pastor of the Northfield church, and during the seven years of his service in these positions Mr. Moody died.[34]

CHAPTER 24 NOTES

1. The copy we noted was one of the Moody Press paperbacks. Remarkably, at no time did Volume 1 or its present issue give the slightest indication except in the index and at the heading of chapter 16 that Scofield had any part in the book. Scofield's contribution at this point has been overlooked by compilers of Scofield bibliographies.
2. Scofield, in Fitt, *op. cit.,* p. 52.
3. Trumbull, *op. cit.,* p. 52.
4. *Ibid.,* p. 8.
5. See Robert L. Pierce, *The Rapture Cult,* p. 50, and any standard history of the period.

6. C. I. Scofield, *Dwight L. Moody as I Knew Him, Moody Bible Institute Monthly,* February, 1922, pp. 799–901, p. 799.
7. C. I. Scofield, *The New Life in Christ Jesus,* BICA, Chicago, 1915, p. 111. The support by Americans for Professor Drummond may have wavered as time passed. It could have been to some extent a creation of the religious press.
8. Scofield, *D. L. Moody as I Knew Him,* p. 801.
9. Trumbull, *op. cit.,* p. 56.
10. Often quoted. We took it from *So Much to Learn,* p. 21.
11. Ernest Sandeen, *op. cit.,* p. 80.
12. Sydney J. Harris, *Strictly Personal, How Slang Conceals Dishonesty,* column of January 22, 1973, in syndicated newspapers.
13. BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 43, from Lindsley, *A History of Greater Dallas and Vicinity,* p. 146.
14. BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 58.
15. So referred to by Richard Ellsworth Day in *Breakfast Table Autocrat, The Life of Henry Parsons Crowell, Moody* Press, 1946, p. 167.
16. Stark, *The Mt. Hermon Church,* 1899, 1939, p. 9.
17. Richard Ellseworth Day, *Bush Aglow,* Judson Press, 1937, p. 306.
18. J. C. Pollock, *Moody without Sankey, Hodder* and Stroughton, p. 256.
19. Gaebelein, *Moody Monthly,* p. 129.
20. Scofield, *Dwight Moody as I Knew Him,* p. 800.
21. *Ibid.*
22. *Moody Bible Institute Monthly,* September 1921, printing the story of the 1916 dinner. Note that Gray did not identify the one who answered the door at the Manse. That detail is taken from *Dr. Gray at Moody Bible Institute* by Wm. M. Runyan, Oxford University Press, 1935, p. 7.
23. Moody, William R., *D. L. Moody,* The MacMillan Company, New York, 1930, p. 52.
24. Letter, Scofield to A. P. Fitt in Moodyiana Collection, *Moody Bible Institute.* Letter written from 558 Fifth Avenue, New York. The address is probably the Manse of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church.
25. *So Much to Learn,* p. 94.
26. *Ibid.*
27. Scofield, *Dwight Moody as I Knew Him,* p. 799.
28. *So Much to Learn,* p. 94.
29. *The Christian,* January 11, 1900, p. 24, 25.
30. *So Much to Learn.*
31. *The Christian.*
32. *So Much to Learn.*
33. *The Christian,* January 11, 1900.
34. *A History of Greater Dallas and Vicinity, Vol.* 11, Selected Biography and Memoirs, Mr. L. B. Hill, Editor, The Lewis Publishing Co., Chicago, p. 282.

CHAPTER 25

The Dispensational Norm or "Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth"

"Open my eyes that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law."
Psalm 119:18

By the time Moody passed on, Scofield was widely known among some Christian groups on both sides of the Atlantic. His reputation was quite different from that which still prevails in Kansas. Those who recognized the religious Scofield held some beliefs which set them off from mainstream Protestant Christianity.

Except when he had been working for the American home Missionary Society, Scofield taught and proclaimed those distinct beliefs. With Moody's death, he was looking toward a new project which would give his ideas a circulation and even a permanence that no 19th Century Christian could have imagined.

The distinctives are a system known as Dispensationalism. An analysis of Scofield's first published work, *Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth,* will give an indication of what Scofield and, more importantly, his backers wanted to propagate.[1]

Using I Timothy 2:15 as a base, Scofield, in opening his work, says:

> The Word of Truth, then, has right divisions, and it must be evident that, as one cannot be "a workman that needeth not to be ashamed" without observing them, so *any study of* that Word which ignores those divisions must be in large measure profitless and confusing.
>
> * * *
>
> The purpose of this pamphlet is to indicate the more important divisions of the Word of Truth. . . .[2]

The thrust of the work appears in the Table of Contents, which lists chapters with the following headings: "The Jew, the Gentile, and the Church of God;" "The Seven Dispensations;" "The Two Advents;" "The Two Resurrections;" "The Five Judgments;" "Law and Grace;" "The Believer's Two Natures;" "The Believer's Standing and State;" and "Salvation and Rewards."[3]

The key verse for the first study is: "Give none offence, neither to the Jews, nor to the Gentiles, nor to the church of God" *(I Cor. 10:32)*. Here Scofield divides the world not into the legendary "two classes" but into three—the idea is warp and woof of Dispensational teaching.

The flaw is that it lacks Biblical basis. In the New Testament, there are but two classes, those in the church and those lost. There is no way that any person of any race or culture can be saved except he come by those steps which bring him into the church—the Body of Christ. There is absolutely no Scripture which supports the idea of Darby and Scofield that a body special to God exists outside the church.

In the second lesson, Scofield presents his idea that there are seven different ways that God has dealt with men. He calls them Dispensations. In a later chapter, we will measure that concept against the Word of God itself, as Scofield placed his ideas alongside the text. Darby, Scofield and successors take unconscionable liberties with the meaning of the word "dispensation."

The third lesson is typical Dispensational teaching. It is based on the premise that those who do not accept Dispensational eschatology do not believe in the return of the Lord and disbelieve in the authority of Scripture. These views have clouded the discussion to a degree unimaginable, have muddied the waters and in many instances have kept believers from breaking with unbelievers. There are reams of evidence that belief in the Lord's return, on a truly Scriptural basis, does not require accepting Scofield's system.

On page 20 of this pamphlet, Scofield notes, "The last prayer in the Bible is for Christ's speedy return" *(Rev. 22:20)*. Now we should note that at least since Emily Cardale in Irving's church in 1831, people of that mental bent have looked for a soon-return. This view puts a strain on the meaning of the Greek word *tachu,* which is agreed to be the key word. But to hold that the hope of a soon-return could be stretched out for more than 1,900 years, an indefinite period, assumes that the Lord is either misusing a word or playing semantics. Neither idea is holy.

Before Scofield wrote, back in 1878, a London pastor, J. Stuart Hussell, noted of the text "Behold I am coming quickly" *(Rev. 22:12)*:

> This may be called the keynote of the Apochalypse: it is the thesis or text of the whole. To those who can persuade themselves that there is *no* indicator of time in such a declaration, "Behold, he is coming" or that it is so indefinite that it may apply equally to a year, a century, or a millenium, this passage may not be convincing; but to every candid judgment it will be decisive proof that the event referred to is imminent.[5]

Russell's point was that the event referred to did take place within a short time span after the words were written and thus are no longer future. Russell's work was one of many carefully overlooked by the Dispensationalists in working up their interpretation. If the imminent event is already past, then our hope lies in another direction entirely.

In that same lesson, Scofield selectively sets out Scriptures which have convinced supporters of both the failure of the church and the

failure of the age. An equally strong list of verses proving the opposite could be quoted. But Scofield says:

> It is, however, sometimes said that this coming cannot occur until after the world has been converted by the preaching of the gospel, and has submitted to the spiritual reign of Christ for one thousand years. It is submitted that this view is wholly erroneous, because:
>
> 1st. Scripture clearly describes the condition of the earth at the second coming of Christ to be one, not of millennial blessedness, but of awful wickedness (Luke 17:26–32, with Gen. 6:5–7 and Gen. 13:13; Luke 18:8; Luke 21:25–27).
>
> 2nd. Scripture describes the whole course of this dispensation from the beginning to the end in such terms as to exclude the possibility of a converted world in any part of it (Matt. 13:36–43, 47–50; Matt. 25:1–10; 1 Tim. 4:1; 2 Tim. 3:1–9; 4:3,4; 2 Pet. 3:3,4; Jude 17–19).
>
> 3rd. The purpose of God in this dispensation is declared to be, not the conversion of the world, but to "gather out of the Gentiles a people for his name." After this he "will return," and *then,* and *not* before, will the world be converted. See Acts 15:14–17; Matt. 24:14 ("for a witness"); Rom. 1:5 ("among," not "of" all nations); Rom. 11:14 ("some," not "all"); 1 Cor 9:22; Rev. 5:9 ("out of," not "all" of).
>
> 4th. It would be impossible to "watch" and "wait" for an event which we knew could *not* occur for more than one thousand years.

Scofield's fourth proposition agrees with J. Stuart Russell, except that Scofield draws an opposite conclusion than does Russell. But all of this gives encouragement to Darby's required abstention from political life. The hopelessness of the cause has meant misdirection of social aims. The interpretation of Scofield was not universally accepted then. It reached the high point just after World War II and is being rejected by steadily increasing numbers today.

In another study, "The Five Judgments," Scofield injected a novelty into interpretation to fit the Dispensational plan. He disregards the long-held teaching about The Great White Throne of Revelation 20: 11–15. The Dispensational view injects human or earthly time into eternity. It sets up a series of judgments which would have the God of the Universe judging so often that he would be busier than a traffic court judge in a resort town on a holiday weekend. The idea is neither reverent or edifying.

Study 6, "Law or Grace," touches one of the most controversial areas of Dispensational teaching. Two issues appear in Scofield's lesson. *One,* what really is the role of Law set out in Exodus 20? *Two,* if one is "free from the Law," is it necessary to be moral? Or to put it another way, will free grace cover everything? We hold that the Scofield position misunderstands God's purpose in giving the Law at Sinai and it misunderstands the role the Law was to play in the nation of Israel.[7] As L. E. Maxwell noted in *Crowded to Christ:*

> Nor should we rashly presume that he who manifested salvation by grace ever since the fall of man should suddenly alter the basic condition of entrance into life to that of a hopeless covenant of works. That a fundamental expositor *(e.g.* Scofield) should fall into precisely the same error as that of carnally minded Jews and reduce the covenant of the Lord Jesus Christ at Sinai to a mere covenant of human works, is to say the least, a revelation of how completely astray we can wander from the Scriptures, once we assume a false premise.[8]

Scofield's position led to a frivolous view of sin. Generations later, the fruit of Scofield's teaching has been the use of the term "legalism" to denigrate any attempt to set (or imply) Biblical standards of conduct. The term "legalism," as used by suburban Evangelicals, carries more than a connotation of Pharisaical hypocrisy.

In his final study, "Believers and Professors," Scofield suggests that his followers will never possess or transmit real power. There will be some who do not "come through" but remain on the fringes. But Scofield's view in this lesson carries the point he thinks the Lord made in the parable of "The Wheat and the Tares" far beyond any sensible interpretation. He seems to have wanted a church full of non-productives.

To appreciate the social and cultural climate for Scofield's teaching, we return to Lesson 2, "The Two Advents." In this regard, we would especially note again Scofield's third proposition: "The purpose of God in this dispensation is declared to be, not the conversion of the world, but to "gather out of the Gentiles a people for his name.' After this he 'will return,' and *then,* and not before, will the world be converted."

It is here that Scofield blares out his Brethren influence. There is a relationship to that noted toward the end of our present chapter 14, the quotation from Harold Rowden and earlier Brethren. The "fact" that the world is *not* to be converted (Darby and Scofield) strengthens the belief that Christians must *not* involve themselves in political or social (in the broad sense) affairs. Too many have learned this lesson only too well.

At the time Scofield was coming to fame, American politics reached what was then considered a nadir to contemporaries (they could not have imagined the present day). Corruption was rampant. Decent people, without Scofield's help, did shun politics. Chicago at the time spawned two "outstanding" civic leaders, "Bath House" Groggins and "Hinkey-Dink" Kenna. Both were able to operate without the least concern that either James M. Gray or C. I. Scofield would ever interfere (probably neither Groggins or Kenna ever heard of these teachers). During the same period, John Alexander Dowie was conducting evangelistic services in his auditorium at Roosevelt and Wabash.[10] Nine blocks south on Wabash Avenue, the Everly sisters were running their notorious "Palace of Pleasure" with complete assurance that neither Dowie, Gray nor

Scofield would ever bother them. The situation corresponds so closely to the Dispensationalist view of I Timothy 4 and II Timothy 3. J. N. Darby must have been delighted.

CHAPTER 25 NOTES

1. C. I. Scofield, *Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth,* Loizeaux Brothers, Neptune, N.J., First Edition 1896.
2. Scofield, *op. cit.,* p. 3.
3. *Ibid.,* p. 2.
4. *Ibid.,* p. 20.
5. J. Stuart Russell, *The Parousia, A Study of* the *New Testament Doctrines of Our Lord's Second Coming,* Baker, Grand Rapids, Mich., reprinted from original edition of 1887, p. 368.
6. Scofield, *op. cit.,* p. 25.
7. We would gather that the Enlightenment philosopher of Jewish origin, Moses Mendelssohn, had a better idea of the significance of Sinai than Scofield. See *Moses Mendelssohn, A Biographical Study,* by Alexander Altmann, University of Alabama Press, 1973.
8. L. E. Maxwell, *Crowded to Christ,* Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1950, p. 20. In *Prairie Overcomer,* May 1984, T. E. Rendall, Maxwell's successor, notes in an article, "L. E. Maxwell, His Literary Legacy": "If any book deserves to called Mr. Maxwell's *magnum opus,* it is his 354 page volume *Crowded in Christ,* the manuscript of which was rejected by Moody Press, but published by Eerdmans in 1950. . . . The reason for its rejection lay in the independent approach of Mr. Maxwell to the entire subject of 'law and grace.' . . . He often quoted the original *Scofield Reference Bible's* comment on the giving of the law at Sinai to illustrate what he had concluded was an erroneous approach to the function of law."
9. Scofield, *op. cit.,* p. 25.
10. Noted in Richard E. Day, *Breakfast Table Autocrat, The Life Story of Henry Parsons Crowell,* Moody Press, 1946, p. 166.

CHAPTER 26

Defender of the Faith

> *". . . ye should contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints."*
>
> Jude 3b

The final years of Scofield's ministry in Northfield seem to be something of an interregnum. It is almost as though with Moody's departure to be with the Lord, Scofield had nothing to do in Massachusetts and was waiting for directions in starting on his next assignment.

Following his usual pattern, Scofield, in July 1901, took a leave from his charge in East Northfield.[1] He joined others of like mind in the first series of new conferences intended to revive the defunct Niagara gatherings. The new conferences were to repeat the theme (balmy to some, doleful to others—the blessed hopelessness) of an ultimately failing and irrelevant church, a hopelessly decaying world and convenient escape (called "The Rapture") for a select "in" group to which the conferees assumed they belonged.[2]

The organizers of the Niagara Conference had gone on record as quite pleased that the conference site on the Canadian side of the Niagara River was secluded, from pollution by tourists and honeymooners who frequented the Falls. The successor conference was to be sure of the same thing—no contact with the common man. (The contrast with the experience of the Lord as related in Mark 12:37 is notable. There it is said ". . . the common people heard him gladly." The Niagara people would have none of that.)

John T. Pirie of the Chicago Department Store family had an estate at Sea Cliff on the North Shore of Long Island. As owner of an estate in one of the most exclusive neighborhoods in America, he offered that estate to the men who had enjoyed the "balmy" Niagara gathering. At Sea Cliff, the hoi polloi could be kept at arms length.

The conference headquarters, for the period July 23-29, 1901 was the Pirie estate itself. Pirie arranged for the erection of a tent on a large plot of ground in the center of the Village of Sea Cliff. There the conference sessions were held. Thus Sea Cliff was an American adaptation of the pattern originated at Albury (England) and carried on at Powerscourt (Ireland).

Arno Clemens Gaebelein, Bible teacher, super prophecy buff, editor of the magazine *Our Hope* and soon to be an editor in association with

Scofield's next and greatest project, was one of the conference speakers. He reported a crucial conference conversation with Scofield:

> One night, about the middle of that week, Dr. Scofield suggested, after the evening service, that we take a stroll along the shore. It was a beautiful night. Our walk along the shore of the sound lasted until midnight. For the first time he mentioned the plan of producing a Reference Bible, and outlined the method he had in mind. He said he had thought of it for many years and had spoken to others about it, but had not received much encouragement. The scheme came to him in the early days of his ministry in Dallas, and later, during the balmy days of the Niagara Conferences he had submitted his desire to a number of brethren, who all approved it, but nothing came of it. He expressed the hope that the new beginning and this new testimony in Sea Cliff might open the way to bring about the publication of such a Bible with references and copious footnotes.[3]

It was at some time during this period that Cyrus Scofield, former private in the 7th Tennessee Regiment of the Confederate Army, received from The United Daughters of the Confederacy, their decoration, the "Cross of Honor." This decoration was given, starting in 1900, by the hundreds to all Confederate veterans (or their heirs) who had not been dishonorably discharged.[4]

After 1901-02, when Scofield referred to his "Cross of Honor" he referred to it as though it was akin to the Congressional Medal of Honor or the Victoria Cross as an award by a government. This bluff worked for years. The cleverly phrased misrepresentation of the nature of the medal went hand-in-hand with Scofield's Bible teaching and his prophetic lectures in the "failing church syndrome." To have deliberate misrepresentation in mind as a great work of Bible study is being gestated is really quite inconceivable. The principle of James 3:11 might be applied here.

Two other actions of Scofield both in 1901 are just a bit out of line for one ostensibly dedicated to a separated life in preparation for the Rapture at any moment. On October 21, 1901, Taft and Martha P. Schmidt deeded to "C. I. Schofield" *(sic)*, a piece of property in the Village of Ashuelot, Town of Winchester, Cheshire County, New Hampshire, estimated to contain about eight and one-fourth acres.[5] Now it should be possible to erect quite an establishment on 8¼ acres. Scofield was to express a desire to own homes in various parts of the world so that he could divide his time as he lived out his days—all assuming that The Rapture did not interfere. At the time he purchased the property, he was 58 years old, so prompt action in erecting a building was indicated. This was quite important as, according to Scofield's own teaching from the pulpit, The Rapture was a threat even as the papers were being signed and settlement made.

Possibly concern about The Rapture was for public consumption only. We shall see that as late as 1907, he, Hettie and another were

still occupying a tent when they stayed at Crestwood, as the property was named.

Speaking at Moody Bible Institute in the tribute to D. L. Moody, previously referred to, Scofield said:

> From my summer home on a mountain top above Northfield, I can see the hill which overlooks the birthplace of Marshall Field, and I can look down into Northfield and see the birthplace of Dwight L. Moody.[6]

Trumbull, keeping in advance of The Rapture, visited Crestwood at some time after the royalties from the Bible had been coming in regularly. He described it:

> It is a steep climb up the New Hampshire mountain roadway, severely testing the hill-climbing powers of an automobile, to get to "Crestwood," the summer home of Dr. C. I. Scofield at Ashuelot. But the hilltop view, after you have reached it, is worth the climb. From the house itself, and the garden round about it, one looks off over the beautiful Connecticut Valley with a sense of satisfying height and distance, and sky and clouds and the glories of God's world. East Northfield, rich with memories of the ministry of D. L. Moody, seen in the distance. Birds and flowers are round about in abundance. A bit of a cabin a hundred yards or more from the house, forms a secluded study for Dr. Scofield, and there one finds chosen treasures of his rich library, marked and well-worn Bibles, and jottings on sermons and addresses.[7]

The other act of 1901 was one that, according to the principles of the Brethren, should have made J. N. Darby spin in his grave. Scofield was admitted to membership in The Lotos Club in New York City. Now such a step was in complete conflict with the standard Plymouth Brethren working interpretation of II Cor. 6:14: "Be ye not equally yoked together with unbelievers."

The Lotos Club is an exclusive club of a sort more common in London, as so often described in British literature. The phenomenon, while present in the United States, has never developed on this side of the Atlantic to the extent it did in England. The founders were prominent New Yorkers, including Whitelaw Reid of *The New York Tribune*. Reid was as good an establishment figure as could be found at the time. The club's purpose as noted in Article I, Section II of its Constitution, was:

> The primary object of this Club shall be to promote social intercourse among journalists, artists, and members of the musical and dramatic professions, and representatives, amateurs, and friends of Literature, Science, and the Fine Arts: and at least one third of the members shall be connected with said classes.[8]

Since the theatre was taboo and worse in the circles where Cyrus had moved since 1879, we assume and we think rightly, that someone felt that Scofield could qualify in the literary catagory. But, that qualification

could hardly have been on the basis of Scofield's literary output up to that time. There must have been anticipation.

The club's Literary Committee, when Scofield's application was presented, included Samuel Untermeyer (1858-1941), a notorious criminal lawyer. Untermeyer's accomplishments, described in *Who's Who in America*[9] take up more than two columns. There is not one activity listed which would suggest that Untermeyer could have appreciated either Scofield's Bible Correspondence Course or his magazine *The-Believer.*[9] Untermeyer's life was so remote from the circles in which Scofield normally moved, that we must remain amazed that Untermeyer would have given Scofield the "white ball" rather than the "black ball." A possible clue—Scofield's "postponed Kingdom" theory (of which more anon—many Christians hold that theory to be without Scriptural basis) was most helpful in getting Fundamental Christians to back the international interest in one of Untermeyer's pet projects--the Zionist Movement. Untermeyer's character was such that stories about him were still circulating in the Metropolitan Area in the late 1940's.

It defies understanding that an "obscure" pastor from the hinterlands, whose literary output up to 1901 consisted of very sectarian booklets, articles and courses, would be considered acceptable in The Lotos Club. Indications are that had Reid or Samuel Untermeyer seen any of Scofield's works, they would have reacted with raucous laughter. Scofield kept up his membershp in Lotos until his death in 1921. The membership was not referred to in any obituary or eulogy. (The Dispensational community knew nothing of it!) The club was given as Scofield's residence in 1912 in *Who's Who in America.*[10] The 1905 letter to Gaebelein was written on The Lotos Club stationery. That gem was first presented to the Christian public by Gaebelein in *Moody Monthly* in 1942.[11] As usual, the penny failed to drop; the significance of The Lotos Club was not noted.

The selection of Scofield for admission to The Lotos Club, which could not have been sought by Scofield, strengthens the suspicion which has cropped up before, that someone was directing the career of C. I. Scofield. Such direction probably was motivated by concerns remote from fidelity to the person, work and truth of Jesus Christ.

Scofield at this time was in regular communication with people in Dallas. Apparently some plans were being laid.[12] The records of the County of Dallas (Texas) includes a deed which states that on March 12, 1902, William G. and Martha Breg conveyed to Mrs. M. C. Starke, Neil Starke and W. S. Mosher, the property at 157 Holmes Avenue, Dallas. The Bregs had held title to No. 157 since Scofield had left for Massachusetts.[13] On the 24th of March, the Starkes and Mosher conveyed the property to Cyrus and Hettie Scofield. The consideration was $1.00 and "the further consideration of love and affection that we have for

the said *C.* I. Scofield and wife Hettie Scofield."[14] The consideration was, even in 1902, far below fair market value. Something was cooking.

The Bible project must have remained on the back burner. It is next mentioned in connection with the Sea Cliff Conference of 1902, held July 20-August 4. In Gaebelein's 1942 relation, the "outpouring of spiritual blessing" was incidental to another issue. Gaebelein reported:

> Again Dr. Scofield and the writer took several walks and, as was to be expected, the chief topic of our conversation was the planned Reference Bible. Dr. Scofield expressed his positive opinion that the time for definite action had come, that after much prayer he had decided to start the work at once. He would resign his position in East Northfield, as he did, and return to Dallas, where he would be able to give more time to this undertaking.[15]

Note that Gaebelein conflicts with himself. He spoke of resigning a "position," singular. But Gaebelein, in the same article, had said that Scofield held two posts. Continuing his narration, Gaebelein said:

> After a second walk along the shore of Long Island Sound he consented that the writer should speak to a number of brethren about the publication of the Reference Bible and sound them out as to there support.[15]

This quotation makes it clear that the Bible project was *NOT* originally based on the support of a broad spectrum of the Christian constituency. It was supported from a select group who were economically able to finance special ideas and ride ideological hobbies.

Alwyn B. Ball, a New York real estate man, was approached for support. Gaebelein notes:

> He fairly bubbled over with joy, and fully endorsed the plan; and, better than that, Mr. Ball pledged a considerable sum of money to assist the project.[16]

To "bubble over with joy" about a project designed to inculcate people with the idea that the only hope for the world is despair, suffering and apostasy, makes a mockery of the victory our Lord achieved on the cross.

John T. Pirie contributed, his largess made possible by the ringing of cash registers in the store on Chicago's State Street. Others approached included John B. Buss of St. Louis (was he aware of Scofield's "French Connection"?) Then Gaebelein went to Francis E. Fitch, a Plymouth Brethren of New York City. Fitch had published Scofield's Bible Correspondence Course. Fitch's principal business was the publishing of New York Stock Exchange lists—a role which put him on the very edge of Plymouth Brethren separation as ostensibly required by Darby's view of II Corinthians 6. Gaebelein notes:

> While the publication of the course was going on Mr. Fitch experienced considerable difficulty with our friend Dr. Scofield, in furnishing the

> needed material on time, which made it very unpleasant for Mr. Fitch, as the subscribers to the course thought the fault was his own. Some charged the delay from the side of Dr. Scofield to procrastination, but the writer thinks it was the kind spirit of our friend which was responsible. It was hard for him to refuse the many appeals which came to him to preach and to teach. He accepted too many calls, hence the completion of the correspondence course was repeatedly delayed. Said Mr. Fitch, "I know he can never finish such a work." I told Dr. Scofield what Mr. Fitch had said, and he cheerfully acknowledged his fault. After our assuring Mr. Fitch that Dr. Scofield would stick to the task before him, Mr. Fitch likewise fell in line with the other brethren, heartily endorsing the proposed Bible.[17]

Which tends to strengthen suspicions about diligence on Scofield's part as well as his basic desire for roles that kept him in the public eye rather than those calling for hard, patient regular work. One gets the impression that the halo which Scofield now wears in the Dispensational community had not been fitted in 1902. Fitch eventually did "join the club."

The close association between Scofield and Gaebelein deserves special comment, particularly as one considers Gaebelein's first autobiography (yes, he did two—a possible case of victory over humility.[18] In *Half a Century, the Autobiography of a Servant,* Gaebelein makes obvious references to his contacts with leaders of industry and business. Sandeen notes that Gaebelein, in a manner quite remarkable for those outside the denominations, never seemed to have the least trouble about financial support.[19] The story of the next few years suggests that the largess was shared to some extent with Scofield.

Gaebelein gives an impression of not grasping the fact that those "captains" (more often lieutenants) of industry who were willing to put money on Gaebelein and through him, Scofield, stopped right there. No indication appears that they cared the least about getting the "gospel" of Dispensationalism accepted in their own peer groups.[20] The "gospel" (the failing church syndrome) was fine for the middle and lower orders who were to purchase Scofield Bibles by the millions. It was not until after World War II that Dispensationalism infiltrated all strata of American culture.

Just like its ideological predecessor, Brethrenism in England, Dispensationalism was a class movement. The "betters," the "rich," the "proper ones," felt that the "any-moment rapture" would be a good idea to keep the middle and lower orders in line. They would not upset the social and economic "applecart" while they were expecting the "any-moment Rapture."

R. J. Rushdoony has commented on the phenomenon:

> There is too little good news in much gospel preaching of today. One of the most prominent of modern fundamentalist preachers has declared,

> in defining the Christian mission as saving souls only, "You don't polish brass on a sinking ship." Such a view is as surely a surrender of the world to the devil as anything the middle ages produced, and the growing importance of such Christianity in its influence on the world scene is a natural consequence of its theology. It is easy for the high and mighty of the world, when it suits their purpose, to give their blessings to such evangelism: after all, it is productive of better citizens, and it leaves them unchallenged.[21]

Of course, businessmen, typically are too much like George F. Babbitt, of Zenith to think these things up. Ideas, when pushed and promoted by Babbitts and Scofield-Bible-carrying Babbitts, come from intellectuals. Rushdoony speaks of:

> . . . the elitism which marks the intellectual. The intellectual believes that his rationality gives him autonomy from God and from the herd-like emotions and appetites of the masses. As a result he feels that he can determine what is good and evil for mankind.[22]

And their cause has received so much help by having a body of devout, faithful people whose greatest expectation is The Rapture. (Dare we call it The Rapture Cult?)

The social implications of Scofield's ploy, with financial help from Gaebelein, as the Matthew Henry of the Progressive Era, may well be a working out of "the Theory of Democratic Elitism." (Credit Peter Bachrach of Bryn Mawr and Temple University for the term.)[23] By now it is quite evident that there is an "elite" who have, by their standards, been successful in running society as they think it should be run. Because of its very eliteness, the elite has accomplished a great deal without, until recently, being exposed or forced to become overt. The group who attended Sea Cliff were the base of Scofield's financial support until the royalties started coming in during the next decade.

On September 10, 1902, A. P. Fitt wrote to Scofield from Moody Institute, Chicago. He asked that Scofield and the others at Northfield join in prayer for the Institute. Scofield, on the 17th, sent a typed reply, committing the folks at Northfield so to do. The closing salutation was:

> "Sincerely your friend and pastor."
>
> *(signed)* C. I. Scofield[24]

A hand written postscript of great significance (to us) read:

> "Our ch. com. unanimously refused to accept my resignation & voted me 6 mos. on ½ salary—they to supply the pulpit. A supply com.—A. G. M. [Moody], Dr. A. Barber & W. Fay Smith—was appointed. We are corresponding with Gray for part of the time.

A call from Dallas was months in the future. But the conveyance of 157 Holmes Avenue in March, and the discussions at Sea Cliff were indications that decisions were being made behind the scenes. Con-

gregational voting would merely rubber-stamp decisions made at the seat of power.

During 1902, a number of problems arose in First Church (Dallas). The incumbent pastor, T. C. Horton, resigned in June. In October, 42 members signed and submitted a resolution stating their intent to withdraw and form a new congregation. The dissent appears from this distance to be largely a matter of personality clashes. Doctrinal differences were a luxury which developed in the seceding group after the secession was accomplished. The dissidents, under the leadership of E. M. Powell, organized a new church.[25] Those remaining loyal to First Church apparently had no appreciation of the vision of Scofield which was to place him on the threshold of worldwide fame. They asked him to return to the essentially parochial role of helping First Church over its local crisis.[26]

Scofield's reaction to the problems of First Church are a bit mystifying. Possibly the burden of the Sea Cliff Conference and the thought of work on the "Bible" were too much for him. He incurred another unspecified illness. The church in Dallas issued a call which reached him at the Sanatorium at Clifton Springs, New York, where he was recuperating.[27] In a letter dated Nov. 13, 1902, Scofield asked the church for more details. But in asking he indicated that he could not give the call serious consideration.[28] It was reported that he had already begun the seven-year task of preparing material for his Reference Bible. Upon his recovery, he went from Clifton Springs back to East Northfield.

By January 1903, Scofield felt able to make a trip to Dallas. During that visit, there must have been serious discussions, some, no doubt, with those in the official life of First Church. On January 19, 1903, writing from 157 Holmes Avenue, he addressed A. P. Fitt at Moody Institute, Chicago. The text is:

> My dear Mr. Fitt:
>
> I have sent in my resignation of the Northfield & Mount Hermon pastorates. While very well in body I do *not* feel that I have recovered sufficient strength to do justice to the Northfield work. As you know, this was my feeling last September. The committee here generously thought otherwise, and I came away—first to Clifton & then here. Now I am convinced that the interests of the church and of the Northfield work require a younger and stronger man.
>
> It is not *certain* that I shall resume my pastorate here, though I am pressed to do so, and am offered an assistant pastor and unlimited liberty to teach and preach whenever the Lord opens the way and I feel led to go.
>
> Invitations have poured in since the papers made that announcement—Charleston, S. C., Savannah, Ga., Richmond, Va., Birmingham, Ala., Memphis & Nashville, Tenn., New Orleans, La., & other places. I have also a pressing invitation to address both the Seminary & the University student body at Princeton.

> I think the Institute ought to be linked on to a big lot of work in Colorado, Kansas, Missouri and Texas—but as to this you will know best.
>
> I expect to keep my summer home at (or near) East Northfield & hope never to lose my deep interest in all the work which Mr. Moody planted. Trusting that the work goes on under blessing and that you, Mrs. Fitt & Emma are well, I am,
>
> Yours as ever
> *Signed* C. I. Scofield
>
> I may say (referring to the enclosed slip) that I have no thought of establishing a college of the Bible here. The Institute is near enough.[29]

There are hints in the correspondence that the needs of the churches were secondary in the discussions. And we again can find behind the words, suggestions (felt at other points in the story) that some specific individual or individuals was (were) making plans for Scofield.

At the time of this particular exchange between Scofield and Fitt, the latter's administration at Moody Bible Institute could be described as interregnum. The period so identified runs from the death of D. L. Moody at the end of 1899 to the appointment of Dr. James M. Gray as dean in 1904. Under consideration for the "helm" at Moody was a "troika." It was proposed to have three deans, each teaching at Moody for four months a year (one school semester) and spending eight months in Bible teaching and evangelistic work in the field.

James M. Gray had consented to be one of the three. Dr. Reuben A. Torrey had also accepted. It was expected that C. I. Scofield would be the third. Torrey, meanwhile, was led more and more into evangelistic work. By September 1905, he wrote Fitt from England:

> I fear I shall not be able to give much time to the Institute for some years to come, even if I do not resign altogether.[30]

No records of any contacts with Scofield on behalf of the Institute "troika" have come to light. Gray, from his appointment as dean in 1904, functioned as administrative head. Whether the "troika" plan might have succeeded will never be known.[31]

Scofield was at the start of a project which was to make his name famous. As the next few years demonstrated, he could never have handled a commitment at Moody as envisioned in the "troika" plan and still have made his contribution to the Scofield Reference Bible.

By the beginning of February 1903, Scofield had returned to East Northfield, terminated the charge and settled his personal affairs and returned to take up duties in Dallas. Trumbull reproduced the resolution adopted by the church in East Northfield when they accepted Scofield's resignation:

> The council discern issues of unusual weight in this case. This church gathers and disperses religious forces felt throughout the Union. Each year from all over the country Christian strangers and many from

> other lands make it a shrine: in part from hallowed associations and more for the pursuit of the higher religious life. The pastor here is, in a measure, a host to Christian pilgrims from half the world. Hence a change of the pastorate touches wide circles in the Gospel kingdom. The pastorate now closing has in its seven years gathered into the church 196 by confession and 112 by letter, a total of 308; and has spent large activities in the yearly convocations held here. It has been marked by strong, skilful, and productive preaching to the dwellers here, to the members of the favored schools here, and to the strangers visiting the town. These have found memorable profit from this pure, fervid, and enriching ministry.
>
> And while the council can but sympathize with the church for the frequent absences of the pastor to meet the calls which his eminent evangelistic power created, they also rejoice in the blessed gifts which have so profited other churches. We trust the Head of the Church will recompense this Zion by future pastoral faithfulness for the sacrifices thus made for other peoples.
>
> It is the happiness of the council to record their enjoyment of the personal relations between themselves and Rev. Dr. Scofield. His urbanity, fraternal fulness of heart, and enkindling spiritual fervors have made him a brother by us; and while deploring our loss of these gifts, they give emphasis to our commendation to him to the churches and ministers of Christ to whom he goes.[32]

BeVier never saw the letter to Fitt, but even as he studied the church records, he seemed to feel that there were unanswered questions.[33] He comments:

> Scofield never liked the Dallas summers, and in 1903 his health was already bad. However, a photograph taken soon after his return to Dallas would *not* suggest any serious illness. He appears portly, with a moustache and gray hair. He looked somewhat like Theodore Roosevelt without the pince-nez.[34]

The health question and the reports of recurring illness still must be marked with question marks. Reference is again made to the quotation from Dr. Sadler in chapter 22.

Health or no, Scofield still managed to cover his summer circuit in 1903, just like a drummer making his calls on the trade. It was on August 9, 1903, that his wanderings found him in Chicago. He delivered at the Chicago Avenue Church (now Moody Church) the sermon entitled "As on Eagles Wings," mentioned in an earlier chapter in which we got the hint that Scofield had been making trips to England long before anyone had any notice of such goings and comings.

In September 1903, Scofield was in Brantford, Ontario for a Bible and prophetic conference at the Zion Presbyterian Church. Scofield was in town ahead of the group and spoke to a group of 200 men at Wickliffe Hall. His text was taken from Acts 26:28,29, where Paul is addressing Festus. The *Brantford Daily Courier* of Monday, the 21st, said that the subject of the message was "Almost or altogether, which?" The paper noted that Dr. *(sic)* Scofield spoke eloquently on the subject, pointing

out the great need for complete and whole conversion.[35] In the light of Scofield's continuing character flaws, the message seems to be another example of Scofield's ability to say what he felt would enhance his status in the Fundamentalist community, knowing full well that it had not really applied to him.

The state of the Dallas congregation in 1903, following that split of the previous autumn should have called for more pastoral activity than the work on the Scofield Reference Bible permitted, even with the associate work of Luther Rees.[36] Scofield's pastoral duties must have been a secondary consideration. And it does not appear that the salary the church was able to pay him provided any substantial cashflow to maintain the Scofield household.

As might reasonably be expected, the arrangement between Scofield and the church, that described in paragraph two of the letter to Fitt, did not work out. By late 1903, Scofield realized that he must either give up work on the Reference Bible or give up the church. Apparently the pastoral duties were, without formal action, shifted on to Luther Rees entirely. Rees at the time was also Congregational missionary superintendent for Texas and Louisiana.[37] Fortunately, the church's condition improved despite the divided leadershp, (see the quote from Blair Neatby at the beginning of chapter 19) and its financial obligations were met.

But Scofield was still faced with the need for a decision. The congregation seems to have continued indulging in group masochism in their determination to cling to Scofield as pastor, even though he had an evident desire for that which would make him a world figure. Apparently, Scofield was prevailed upon to make a decision which was no decision.[38] That matter had to be reconsidered at subsequent church business meetings in 1905 and 1906.

Early in 1904, Scofield addressed a gathering of Confederate veterans in Dallas, probably the State Convention of the United Confederate Veterans. The message, preserved only in his outline, was mentioned in chapter 6 because it could throw light on his activities during the last years of The War Between The States. In that outline (on page 4) we find the following: "right superior race to bear white man's burden of an inferior race in its own way."[39] The notes continue:"seemed as if *principle* lost/I permit no man to go before me in admiration *of Puritan character* etc, etc./But today *principle* conceded." The evangelical movement today would brand the first quoted note as "racist." The idea pregnant in the note is contrary to views held and espoused in Michigan, Massachusetts and Kansas. We cite it to show that Scofield was always able and willing to please the ears of a particular audience by special references. This could mean being at different times on different sides of any ideological fence. It does not suggest changing views, but views which changed easily with the occasion.

CHAPTER 26 NOTES

1. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 67.
2. See chapter 21.
3. Gaebelein, *op. cit., Moody Monthly,* January 1943, p. 278. The story of the Sea Cliff Conferences is largely based on this relation.
4. See chapter 5 for details of the Cross of Honor.
5. From the deed, copy supplied by the register of deeds, Cheshire County, New Hampshire.
6. C. I. Scofield, *"Dwight Moody As I Knew Him," Moody Bible Institute Monthly,* February 1922, p. 798.
7. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 115.
8. Constitution, The Lotos Club. Copy supplied by The New York Public Library. The club declined to answer queries by the writer.
9. *Who's Who in America,* Vol. 8, 1920-1921, p. 1264.
10. *Who's Who in America,* Vol. 7, 1912-1912, p. 1856.
11. First reproduced in *Moody Monthly,* October 1942, p. 66. Later used by Frank E. Gaebelein in *The Story of The Scofield Reference Bible,* Oxford University Press, New York, 1959, p. 12.
12. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 61.
13. Breg was at one time superintendent of the Sunday school of First Church. He was actively engaged in finance and utilities, having connection with Eastern financiers, and was ultimately an official of the Dallas Gas Company.
14. From the text of the deed, supplied by the County of Dallas.
15. Gaebelein, *op. cit.*, January 1943, p. 279.
16. *Ibid.*
17. *Ibid.*
18. Our Hope Publishing Company, New York, 1931.
19. Ernest R. Sandeen, The *Roots of Fundamentalism, British and American Millenarianism,* 1800-1930, Chicago, 1970, p. 214,215.
20. Note again Carl Henry's admission of evangelical irrelevancy: "Another year has passed in which the movement has registered no notable influence on the formative ideas and ideals of American culture." *TIME,* December 1957. Eighty years of no progress is unusual, but the Premills have managed it.
21. R. J. Rushdoony, *By What Standard, A* Critique of Cornelius Van Til, p. 175.
22. R. J. Rushdoony, *Revolt Against Maturity,* Thoburn Press, 1977, p. 127.
23. Peter Bachrach, *The Theory of Democratic Elitism, A Critique,* Little Brown & Company, 1967.
24. Letter in the Moodyiana Collection, Moody Bible Institute, written on the letterhead of The Scofield Bible Correspondence Course by C. I. Scofield, D.D. The letterhead refers all business correspondence to Francis Fitch.
25. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 69. Also Ernest B. Comstock, Ed., *History of Central Congregational Church 1902-1952,* Dallas, 1952, p. 7.
26. Letter to Scofield, November 13, 1902. Letter from Scofield, Nov. 13, 1902, in church records, Scofield Memorial Church, Dallas.
27. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 72.
28. Letters of November 1902.
29. Letter, Scofield to A. P. fitt. Original in Moodyiana Collection, Moody Bible Institute, Chicago.
30. Torrey's letter is reproduced in *Dr. Gray at Moody Bible Institute,* by William Runyan, Oxford University Press, 1935. Torrey's letter is on page 139 where the story of the "troika" plan is related.

31. The "troika" plan appears to have been largely forgotten. But one of the present staff at Moody commented to the writer that it would never have worked. The three men were too "strong willed" to have pulled together.
32. Quote in Trumbell, *op. cit.*, p. 54.
33. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 72-72.
34. *Ibid.*
35. Copy of the newspaper article supplied through the courtesy of Brantford Public Library (Ontario).
36. *Ibid.*, p. 73, based *on* pastor's report for 1903. First Congregational Church, Dallas, Mss. Our understanding of the role of Luther Rees was helped by a letter from P. R. Byers, present pastor of the Paris Bible Church, Paris, Tex., formerly the Main Street Congregational Church. Byers made it clear that Rees, while ordained, never gave up a role in business and pastored in Paris only between the terms of other pastors. Thus he was also available for work in Dallas in assisting Scofield.
37. 1903 Report First Church.
38. *Ibid.*
39. From Outline "Address to Confederates" in Collection of Scofield Sermon Outlines, donated to Moodyiana Collection by Rev. Wendell P. Loveless.

CHAPTER 27

Across the Bounding Main

"They that go down to the sea in ships, that do business in great waters."

Psalm 107:23

As Scofield was dividing the Word and his time (as pastor, speaker and commentator) he gave evidence of developing a wanderlust. The rationalization was that research was needed to produce the quality references envisioned for the Reference Bible. Of course, if the proposed work was to receive worldwide circulation, some indication of European research would reduce the "stigma" of its being a purely "Yankee" work. (That had not hampered the spread of the Mormon message and the Book of Mormon supposedly given to a Yankee.)

By early 1904, a trip to Europe for Cyrus and Hettie was in the planning stage. In those days, a real cash flow was necessary for travel to Europe. (It is exactly this point which raises so many questions about the previous trips by Cyrus which he must have made to produce the reference to the Horse Guards.) Gaebelein's solicitations in this period of Scofield's life were both indispensible and evidently successful. The trip became a reality.

Some reports of the trip are quite specific. The trip was the first abroad for Hettie. Cyrus, by his own admission, had been there before (when has been carefully hidden among reports of conference engagements). The original intent was to spend two months on vacation. The remaining time abroad—which stretched to nine months—was supposed to be for work on the Reference Bible. We have found no reference to Noel during 1904.

Possibly the publicity-type stories which circulated in the Fundamentalist press during the second decade of the century were not always accepted at face value. When Trumbull was writing his story of Scofield, he commented on the European junket in a manner which suggested he was answering critics by making a confident assertion:

> Did the sojourns in Great Britain and elsewhere in Europe make any real contribution to the Scofield Reference Bible, apart from the opportunity they gave of freedom from interruption in the work? Could not this Reference Bible just as well have been made at home without stepping foot out of the United States? The question has been sincerely asked, and the facts here given answer it.
>
> It is true that most of the explanatory and interpretetive comment represents material that was familiar to the comparatively few soundly

> instructed and well-grounded students of the Word of God in our country and abroad. But the work done on the Scofield Reference Bible includes far more than this. It is a result that could have been produced only after an exhaustive study of books, and conferences with men, both friendly and unfriendly to the Word of God, both believing and unbelieving, both conservative and radical, so that every statement of the editor was finally made only after an intelligent and scholarly familiarity with the whole realm of modern Bible Research. When a positive statement is made in the notes it is made in full recognition of the negative positions on that same point. All this made possible an orientation of the editor and gave the work a background, an atmosphere, a sometimes tacit evidence of familiarity with all view-points while presenting only the true viewpoint, which could never have been brought to pass without the travel and contact and research that went into it.[1]

A most excellent comment by Trumbell, if the notes, on analysis, really reflect great scholarship, but some reservations are in order.

Before starting on a serious work, Cyrus and Hettie according to reports, enjoyed to the full a stay in London. (We hope their enjoyments were fully acceptable to Fundamental and Brethren standards.) But even during those months of ostensible vacation a contact of major importance was made. Throughout the Scofield story, especially the part after 1879, there is always a place where, if nothing else serves as explanation, we can find traces of Brethren influence. The major contact of 1904 was arranged through one of the Brethren.

Robert Scott of the London religious publishing house of Morgan & Scott (now Marshall, Morgan & Scott) is mentioned as one of those attending the 1898 Northfield Conference. Scott was, as far as we can find out, no relation to either Walter of Kenilworth or to Bible teacher Walter, residing in Bristol, England. As Scott is introduced in the story, it is not possible to tell whether Scofield and Scott first met in Northfield in 1898 or whether they met during one of those undated times when Scofield saw the Horse Guards. The acquaintance between Scofield and Scott had developed in 1898 as they had enjoyed the conference. In 1904, Scofield must have made at least one call at the firm headquarters, 12, Pasternoster Buildings, Ludgate Hill, London. And the Scotts entertained the Scofields. At some time during the two month's stay in England, the Scotts took the Scofields down to their country home in the delightful Surrey countryside near Dorking. No doubt they traveled by train, probably starting from London Bridge Station. In 1904, the engine may have been still painted in the wonderful yellow livery invented earlier by William Stroudley.[2]

At Dorking, Scofield was only five or six miles from Albury where banker Henry Drummond's money had been used to institute a major shift in the direction of the church, a move which Scofield continued to push.

During the visit to Dorking, Scofield told Scott of his plans for a new "Reference Bible." Trumbull reported the conversation as Scofield related it to him 15 years later:

> "Who is going to publish it?" at once asked Mr. Scott.
>
> "I do not know," was the reply. "I have not taken that up. The first thing I must do is to get the material ready; then it will be time enough to think of a publisher."
>
> "But the question of the publisher is one of the utmost importance," replied Mr. Scott. "And there is only one concern that ought to publish that Bible. My own house would be glad to publish it, of course; but we could not give it the worldwide introduction which it must have. The publishers of this Bible must be the Oxford University Press."
>
> "I do not know any one connected with the Oxford Press," said Dr. Scofield.
>
> "I can easily arrange that," answered Mr. Scott; and forthwith he took his friend to call upon Mr. Henry Frowde, then the head of the great Bible publishing house of Great Britain and the English-speaking world.[3]
>
> Mr. Frowde was interested. He said he would consult Mr. Armstrong, then head of the American branch of the Oxford University Press. Mr. Armstrong was immediately enthusiastic at the suggestion that this new Reference Bible be brought out by the Oxford Press, and a preliminary understanding was quickly reached. Mr. Frowde assured Dr. Scofield that, if he finally decided to place the Bible with them, they could readily arrange a proper contract for the publication, in the interests of each party. And so the publishing question was settled, God having fulfilled his word that "before they call, I will answer" *(Isaiah* 65:24).[4]

And here enters another possible flaw in the story. Armstrong was assigned to Oxford's New York branch. Was he in London, for vacation or reporting to the home office? Did Frowde cable him or did he keep Scofield (and Scott) on hold while steamers crossed and recrossed the Atlantic with question and reply. The trans-Atlantic telephone was years in the future. Despite the reported enthusiasm, no binding commitments were to be made for more than three years. It is easy to infer from available material that in 1904 there was nothing tangible which would give Frowde justification for drawing up a contract.

Scofield did not keep an itinerary of his travels and we are not really sure when he traveled. The various reports are in conflict at many points. The story here represents this writer's attempt to resolve conflicting stories. It is apparent that after about two months in England, Cyrus and Hettie traveled to Switzerland. They settled at Montreux, at the east end of Lake Geneva. The declared intention of going to Montreux was to permit uninterrupted work on the Bible. It was not to be. For four months, Scofield reportedly was sick and unable to do any work whatsoever.[5]

At this point in the narrative, either Trumbull slipped up or else Scofield was carried away and Trumbull's editorial skill deserted him. Two pages after relating the four-months sickness, Trumbull states

that Scofield spent nine months at Montreux in uninterrupted labor. One of the stories is inaccurate. And Gaebelein confuses things further by stating that the illness at Montreux was in 1906—when other sources have Scofield at Lake Orion, Michigan, not Switzerland.[6]

To prepare for the period of work, Scofield had ordered from Geneva a supply of large-page, wide-margin notebooks.[7] Scofield planned to paste the text of the entire Bible, page by page into the notebooks. The pages would receive the notes as he worked them up. These notebooks, purchased in mid-1904, were the first recorded tangible evidence of actual production of a work for which Scofield and Gaebelein had been soliciting funds for two years.

While Cyrus was sick, Hettie was not idle. She was the one who pasted the entire Bible, page by page, into the notebooks. Some pages were never to have much more than the text of Scripture on them, right up to that day in 1908 when they were handed to the typesetters. The notebooks were ready for Cyrus when he recovered. They were to become among the most traveled in religious history. How much use was made of them before they were torn apart by the typesetters remains a question.

A source in Dallas claims that while overseas, Scofield made a trip to the Holy Land.[8] The trip must have taken place either very late in 1904, at some time after the four months illness, or early in 1905. But after a debilitating illness and faced with a widely announced schedule of heavy work, time for a lengthy excursion seems unlikely. Travel times of various routes linking Switzerland and Palestine were looked at. The search included the schedule of the famous "Orient Express." A trip with any reasonable time to view the "holy" sites could not have been made in less than a month or six weeks. Two months would be more likely. But in the face of the illness, such a trip would leave little time for working on the notebooks, so carefully prepared by Hettie.

The matter is complicated by the usual reticence about the specific nature of Scofield's illness. Travel in the Holy Land in the first decade of this century was not for the ailing. Either the trip was not made or else precious little time was spent at Montreux in writing. Take your choice.

Exact travel dates are not available, but early (before June) in 1905 Scofield and Hettie returned to Dallas. Trumbull quite plainly declares that Scofield's finances, or rather lack of same, required the return.[9] The funds previously obtained through Gaebelein's efforts had been exhausted by payments to Swiss physicians or by baksheesh to muledrivers in Galilee. In early 1905, a regular cash flow in sufficient amount had not developed.

When Scofield returned to Dallas, he found the church in need of more pastoral attention than could be provided by a "scholar" on the

threshold of worldwide fame. The church was paying the price for trying to hold on to Scofield. Once again, Scofield faced a decision. The result again was a decision which was no decision. He again "found out" what he had noted in 1902 and 1903. He could not properly minister to the church and make genuine progress on the Reference Bible.[10]

The decisions appear to have been made for him. Reports indicate that he became ill.[11] He returned to the Sanitarium at Clifton Springs, New York, to recuperate and work on his opus. The notebooks made another journey. It would seem that New York City was on the route from Dallas to Clifton Springs. Gaebelein reproduced a letter written by Scofield on stationery of The Lotos Club:

12

In view of the statement made by Gaebelein in 1942, (to which we referred in chapter 24, that Scofield was to give D. L. Moody in-

struction in prophecy, the deference to Gaebelein expressed here is interesting.[13] Actually the letter may have been written more with a view to impressing future readers or for use in an ad than for any actual communication with Gaebelein. But it tends to confirm the impression of Robert L. Pierce (and others) that Gaebelein had much to do with the shaping of Dispensational prophetic views.[14] As already noted, no one raised any question about The Lotos Club.

At Clifton Springs, Scofield was joined by Miss Ella Pohle, who had helped him with the preparation of the Bible Correspondence Course. Miss Pohle remained with Scofield for the next year and was a material help in the work on the Bible.

Back in Dallas, the church called a Scofield protege, the Rev. W. Irving Carroll from the associated Grand Avenue Church to the post of associate pastor at First Church. This no doubt helped to cover those areas not handled by Scofield.[15] At a business meeting, the church, in addition to confirming Carroll as associate at a salary of $1,500 per year, retained Scofield as pastor. His salary was set at $1,000 per year.[16] That figure suggests that Gaebelein must have been hitting the solicitation trail hard. Even in 1905, $1,000 per year was hardly capable of supporting scholarship, keeping Hettie in hats and Noel in school, and most important of all, paying the dues of The Lotos Club.

CHAPTER 27 NOTES

1. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, pp. 102, 103.
2. See *The London, Brighton and South Coast Railway* by C. Hamilton Ellis, Ian Allen, Ltd., 1960, especially p. 105 and p. 162 for the story of "Stroudley's Improved Engine Green" as the near sighted expert called his yellow color.
3. The reference to Oxford University Press solely as a Bible Publishing House suggests complete cultural ignorance on someone's part or else a desire to keep the clientele in that state. See the 500th Anniversary pamphlet of Oxford University Press issued in 1978 for a better picture of the true scope of the Press.
4. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, pp. 89-90.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 90. Compare with p. 94.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 94. Gaebelein, *The Story of The Scofield Reference Bible*, p. 344, Moody Monthly.
7. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 94.
8. L. B. Hill, *A History of Greater Dallas and Vicinity*, p. 282.
9. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 94; BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 75.
10. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 75.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 76; Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 95.
12. First reproduced in *Moody Monthly*, October 1942, p. 66, later used in The *Story of The Scofield Reference Bible*, 1909-1958 by Frank E. Gaebelein, Oxford, New York, 1958, p. 12.
13. Gaebelein's statement is in *Story*, p. 129, *Moody Monthly.*
14. See *The Rapture Cult* by Robert L. Pierce, Signal Point Press, Signal Mountain, Tennessee, 1978.
15. Record Book, MSS, First Congregational Church, Dallas, p. 215.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 213.

CHAPTER 28

The Road to Oxford

> *"... I will go along by the highway, I will neither turn unto the right hand nor to the left."*
>
> Deut. 2:27b

Where was Scofield when the year 1906 came in? Gaebelein places him in Montreux, Switzerland.[1] But Trumbull had him in Dallas during much of 1905. As the year passed on Scofield again realized that he could not go on with the Bible work and the church work together. He had something of a breakdown in health. He spent the winter at Clifton Springs, New York. Trumbull comments that this was:

> ... not such much as an invalid but because of the splendid facilities there for the best food and air, and medical attention when needed, and at the same time freedom to go on with his work.[2]

Miss Ella Pohle joined the Scofields and helped in the work.

The Dallas church in a business meeting in January raised Scofield's salary to $3,000 per year with full freedom for meetings and other activities as opportunities arose.[3] Even in 1906, the $3,000 would hardly support the lifestyle and activities of three Scofields.

By May 1906, Scofield had made some progress on the notes and felt able to travel. Cyrus, Hettie and Ella and, of course, the notebooks came to New York City. For Cyrus, The Lotos Club was available. Hettie and Ella, at a location undisclosed, continued the work of placing the cross references on the proper pages of the notebooks. Before the end of the month, the trio moved to New Hampshire. This is the first note we have of the Crestwood Camp property being used. And camp they did. No buildings had been erected, so tents were necessary. One large tent was for living and sleeping; a smaller tent was a work area. No mention of other facilities. Rather rugged for a man of 63 with questionable health. And there is no indication of the place of 17-year-old Noel.

It is at this point that Gaebelein's narrative is, at best, quite faulty.[4] In chapter 24, we provided an alibi for his inaccuracy, the alibi being a quotation from Frank Maloy Anderson. Without recalling the alibi, we hereby note the inaccuracy without making a value judgment. Gaebelein has Scofield going to Europe in 1904, staying two years with four months sickness at Montreux in 1906, and an arrival in New York

on May 25, 1906. His claim is supported by the alleged text of a letter, dated May 27, 1906, and from Crestwood Camp, reading:

> Crestwood Camp
> Ashuelot, N. H.
> May 27, 1906
>
> My beloved Brother,
>
> We reached New York Friday after a slow but pleasant voyage, and came right here. Was sorry to pass through New York without seeing you, but could ill bear the expense of a delay with my family. . . . Thanks for Stebbins' letter. I am in splendid health, rested and refreshed by the voyage of thirteen days. I must soon go to New York. Will let you know when the date is fixed. Found here a pressing invitation to occupy my old pulpit at East Northfield next Lord's Day and I have accepted. Love to all.
>
> As ever yours,
> C. I. S.[5]

If the letter is valid, ship arrivals in the Port of New York for Friday, May 25, 1906, should show an arrival which fits with the travel story. *The New York Times* for that day lists eleven ships, including five from Mediterranean ports, one from South Shields, England. The S. S. Provence had departed Le Havre, France, on May 19, not fitting in any way the 13 day voyage mentioned in the letter. And Le Havre is never mentioned as an embarkation point in the Scofield story.

Now, according to material developed by BeVier, Scofield had been in Dallas in January 1906, then gone to Clifton Springs.[6] Even if the Scofields and Miss Pohle had used the Hudson River Day Line from Albany, the trip to New York from Clifton Springs could hardly be described as a voyage.

The reliability of Gaebelein's story is further impaired by the fact that in 1942 he reproduced a letter Scofield wrote him on September 2, 1905. The letter was on stationery of The Lotos Club in New York, so we may reasonably assume that he was not in Switzerland at the time.[7] Yet according to Gaebelein's story, Scofield should have been in Montreux on the last lap of his two-year sojourn. Interestingly enough, neither Gaebelein as writer or book editor nor the magazine editor at Moody noticed the discrepancy.

The origination of the text of the letter published with the date of May 27, 1906, is obscure. When he wrote in 1942, Gaebelein declared that he had on his desk an accumulation of Scofield's letters from 1903 to 1909. Chronological arrangement should have provided a basis for a more accurate itinerary.[8]

But back to three-in-a-tent at Ashuelot. The story as related by all previous writers suggests that all three kept up work on the great opus throughout 1906. But Gaebelein refutes his own claim by reference to a letter written on June 9, 1906. Scofield was preparing to leave the

tent for the luxury of John Pirie's Estate at Sea Cliff, Long Island, to revel further in balmy days when supposedly mature men discussed the prospect of suffering, repression and devastation for others not so fortunate as to be on John Pirie's invitation list. Gaebelin quotes:

> God help us to meet the seriousness of the days in which we live, with an apostate Church, an unnourished Body, a lost world, and an impending advent as our environnent.[9]

Since we can write about the letter nearly 80 years after it was written, it would seem that the "impending advent" idea is wearing a bit thin, even though it has helped spread apostasy and devastation over the world.

BeVier, overlooking the Sea Cliff sojourn, comments that during 1906, Scofield was in almost continuous contact (mostly by mail, postage 2c an ounce) with his seven consulting editors.[10] Nothing has come to light which provides any clue as to Scofield's reasons for selecting the individuals so designated. They were:

Arno C. Gaebelein:	"Prophecy Buff", lecturer, editor and writer
Henry G. Weston:	Crozier Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa.
William J. Erdman:	Presbyterian minister and author
James M. Gray:	President, Moody Bible Institute, Chicago
Arthur T. Pierson:	Author, editor, pastor. Sometime pastor of Spurgeon's Tabernacle, London
W. P. Moorehead:	President, Xenia Theological Seminary, Xenia, Ohio
Elmore Harris:	President, Toronto Bible Institute, Toronto, Canada.[11]

Gaebelein, super "prophecy buff" with prophetic views identical to Scofield's was the specialist on prophecy as confirmed by that 1905 letter from The Lotos Club. In his relation, Gaebelein notes that Scofield told him that he exchanged many letters with Dr. W. J. Erdman about the term "kingdom" and its use in the New Testament.[12]

In September 1906, Scofield wrote the church in Dallas of his intention to go to London for more study. The research was ostensibly required in the preparation of the Scofield notes.[13] The church responded by continuing the existing arrangement until the following April, later extending it to the end of 1907. Scofield, after receiving confirmation of the extensions, departed for Europe with Hettie and the notebooks. (We do not know how Miss Pohle occupied her time while two-thirds of the trio were traveling. Still no word of Noel.)

Gaebelein was not the only one who, in relating the Scofield story, was "mixed up" at this point. Trumbull was also inaccurate and, in fact, may have provided the basis for Gaebelein's mix-up, made 23 years later. On his page 97, Trumbull declares that Scofield stayed in Europe two years. The statement is impossible, as it conflicts with

church records and would make impossible the completion of the Bible as it was actually produced.[14]

The 1903 reference Scofield made to the Horse Guards suggests that by 1906 he was more familiar with London than most American clergymen of the period. But apparently he had not been to Oxford. He did visit the city in 1906. But we have no hint as to how he reacted to the "City of Bells" when he was there late in 1906.

One may not agree with much that is, and has been, taught at Oxford, but one cannot help being affected by the city itself. More than a generation later, Sheldon Vanauken described the way he and Jean felt when they were there in the 1950's:

> Meanwhile, we explored Oxford's grey magic, Oxford "that sweet City with her dreaming spires", Oxford and all the country round, sometimes on our bikes, sometimes on foot. . . .
>
> Coming back to Oxford, we were always, it seemed, greeted by the sound of bells: bells everwhere striking the hour or bells from some tower change-ringing, filling the air with a singing magic. We explored every cranny of this city of enchanting crannies and unexpected breathtaking views of towers and spires. We were conscious all the time of the strong intellectual life of a thousand years. Despite the modern laboratories, Oxford is still "breathing the last enchantments of the middle ages"; this wall part of a great abbey; the Benedictines built the long, lovely buildings that are part of one college quad; the narrow passage where we bought tea things has been called Friars Pantry for centuries; the Colleges bear names like Christ Church and Mary Magdalen and Corpus Christi, and the bells with their lovely clamour have rung through the centuries.
>
> Imperceptibly the ages of faith, when men really believed, when the soaring spires carried their eyes and thoughts up to God, became real to us, not something in a book. . . .[15]

In the milieu which generated the Scofield phenomenon, reactions like those of the Vanaukens would have been considered either irrelevant or "worldly." Trumbull describes the Scofield days in Oxford:

> Here the treasures of the Oxford libraries were fully at the disposal of the man who was making himself a Bible scholar by mastering the Bible scholarship of the world. He was by no means content to limit his studies and researches to constructive and believing Bible scholarship. He covered the whole field of such scholarshp, whether friendly or unfriendly to the Bible. He wanted to know at first-hand all the critics claimed to have done, and he was open to any light that their scholarly researches might, known or unknown to themselves, throw upon the Word of God. He found Prof. Dr. William Sanday, an outstanding scholarly critic, gracious in his readiness to confer. So also with the more extreme critic, Prof. S. R. Driver. Of the conservative Bible scholars abroad, Dr. Scofield gratefully acknowledges his indebtedness to Profs. A. H. Sayce and David Samuel Margoliouth, of Oxford, and to Mr. Walter Scott, the eminent Bible teacher.[16]

Profs. Sayce and Driver were, according to some reports, considered conservative. Margoliouth was noted as being "eccentric."[17] As for Walter

Scott, like so many others in the Brethren lineage, we know absolutely nothing about him. Even the library of his native city, Bristol, could tell us nothing. Were it not for the Scofield visit we might suspect a *nom de plume.*

A serious flaw in the whole Oxford story slipped out during the great Memorial Service for Scofield held in Dallas in November 1921. at that time, Irving Carroll noted:

> I sought to get him to talk of his visits to Oxford University and to hear from his lips something of the conversation around the faculty table in the dining hall. Little would he ever say and always was anxious to turn the conversation into other channels.[18]

Carroll's comment gives a bit of substance to a suspicion which lurks behind Trumbull's relation. There really wasn't much research nor discussion of theological issues. We hold to this position despite the purpose declared by Trumbull:

> It was Dr. Scofield's deliberate purpose to put himself under obligation to the entire field of modern Bible study and scholarship. All through his labors on the Reference Bible he was consulting, either by correspondence or personal interview, the leading scholarly and spiritual Bible students of different lands.[19]

If our suspicion is correct, then much of Trumbull's chapter IX, "The Debt To Scholarship," from which these quotes were taken, is propaganda designed to promote a work to a place far beyond its merits, intrinsic or otherwise. Trumbull's statement: "He covered the whole field of such scholarship, whether friendly or unfriendly to the Bible"[20] becomes patently impossible. Its improbability should have been evident to Evangelicals long ere this.

It is possible that there were some suspicious ones even while Trumbull wrote. Carried away by his effort to establish valid scholarship, Trumbull says (we repeat the quotation):

> Did the sojourns in Great Britain and elsewhere in Europe make any real contribution to the Scofield Reference Bible, apart from the opportunity they gave of freedom from interruption in the work? Could not this Reference Bible just as well have been made at home without stepping foot out of the United States?"[21]

Actually the more one considers the ideas that made up this work, the more one studies the reported travels, the stronger the suspicion is that *no* genuine scholarship was involved. The two trips to Europe may have been purely for effect. The effect was greatly heightened by the laborious transportation of the boxes of notebooks.

But was Oxford really a place where one devoted to Jesus Christ could get the advice, the assistance which would honor the Lord? David Fountain has commented on the Evangelical influence at Oxford as it would have been felt at the time Scofield visited:

> In England evangelicals were anxious to impress society. They had been kept out of Oxford and Cambridge, and when they were let in they tried to make an impression by their academic attainments. Theology was studied in precisely the same way as mathematics, history or science. The fatal mistake was made of approaching this Book as any other book, by studying it only to gain credit with the world. "Desiring to be teachers of the law . . ." They approached this Book in a way in which it was never intended to be approached—in order to impress the world. But the same mistake is still being made, and shows little sign of abating.[22]

How safe was that Oxford for an intellectually agile but untrained cleric from the hinterlands of the American continent?

And a negative influence from the Oxford climate was spelled out in the Introduction to the Scofield Bible when it came out in 1909. On the second page of the Introduction, Scofield acknowledged the influence of two Oxford Biblical scholars, Hort and Westcott. At the time of Scofield's visit (and it has continued to this day), many professional theologians were permeated or should we say mesmerized by the textual views of these two men.

A comment of the Rev. Terrence Brown of the Trinitarian Bible Society, London, spells out the matter:

> In the 1860's the Codex Sinaiticus and Codex Vaticanus became available to Biblical scholars, and in 1881 Westcott and Hort advanced the theory that the New Testament text was preserved in an almost perfect state in these two fourth century manuscripts.
>
> Westcott and Hort devised an elaborate theory, based more on imagination and intuition than upon evidence, elevating this little group of MSS to the heights of almost infallible authority. Their treatise on the subject and their edition of the Greek N.T. exercised a powerful and far-reaching influence, not only on the next generation of students and scholars, but also directly upon the minds of millions who have had neither the ability, nor the time, nor the inclination to submit the theory to a searching examination.
>
> Those who do so will find that the whole theory was based upon a fundamental error, namely the assumption that the reliability of these 4th century documents was in proportion to their age. There were no doubt bad copies in every age, some corrupted by accident, some by ignorance and some by design. These two exhibit the most amazing number of incorrect readings.[23]

Generations of Biblical scholars have followed the Westcott and Hort trail. No doubt for some the original conditioning to accept Westcott and Hort came while they were using Scofield. Unfortunately, Scofield was not trained in Greek, so in the textual area, he may have been more of a disservice than a help.

In a history of the City of Dallas, published in 1909 while Scofield still had ties in the area, it is stated that Scofield lectured in a number of spots in the British Isles and to English speaking audiences in Rome,

Paris and Berlin.[24] Now, one cannot research and still travel around to lecture. Since the entire junket could not have lasted more than seven months, any lecture time would have meant that much less time for research and for writing. Conspicuous transport of boxes of notebooks could not make up for time spent digging into accumulated volumes of past years.

The same Dallas source has Scofield working in the Library founded by John Calvin in Geneva.[24] (Trumbull places Calvin's Library at Lausanne, not Geneva.)[25] Quite frankly, the more one studies the travel story, the more one gets the impression that it could have been created to give an impression of someone who was everywhere, doing everything, all the time.

The Scofields, man, woman, luggage and notebooks, did end up at Montreux, Switzerland.[26] According to Trumbull, Scofield engaged in further study. But he relates this to a two-year stay. This two-year stay, claimed by several sources, is disproven by the fact that they started back to the United States in the Spring of 1907, far less than a year after leaving New York.

The port of departure from Europe was determined by a matter of a more convenient way of handling those boxes of notebooks. They sailed from the port of Boulogne, France.[27] When this writer read of the embarkation at Boulogne, he was skeptical to the point of unbelief. Boulogne could not handle trans-Atlantic liners: Through contact with the leading historian of trans-Atlantic steamship services, Mr. N. R. P. Bonsor,[28] it was learned that just at the time the Scofields and their boxes made the 1907 return to the States, two steamship lines, Holland-American and Hamburg-American (HAPAG), experimented with calls by certain ships at Boulogne en route to New York.[29] And just as Scofield related to Trumbull, a tender carried passengers and luggage from the quay to the liner anchored in the roadstead. Mr. Bonsor even supplied a list of ships with dates of call at Boulogne.

The detail indicates that Scofield was in the hands of people with expert knowledge of travel routes. Normally a trip from Switzerland to New York would have meant train to Paris, then would follow a battle with porters at Gare de Est and a cab ride through Paris to Gare St. Lazare, another battle with porters, thence onto a train for a channel port. Instead, going via Boulogne, the Scofields boarded at Montreux one of the great European expresses destined for Boulogne (with connection to London). At Boulogne Maritime Station they were met by a representative of the steamship line who arranged for the transfer of both luggage and the precious boxes of notebooks to the tender and on to the liner. For a man of 64, as prone to illness as Scofield was reputed to be, the whole arrangement was a blessing.

Trumbull related an incident which may show how close the Christian community came to missing the spread of Dispensationalism:

> The ocean voyage went by uneventfully. The steamer was within one day of New York City when somehow Dr. Scofield felt strongly impressed with the desire to see if his precious boxes were safe in the baggage hold of the steamer.
>
> With one of the steamship officers he went to satisfy himself. The boxes were not there.
>
> With a sinking heart Dr. Scofield realized that the boxes might easily have been left in the tender, on the other side of the Atlantic, and then have been carried back to Boulogne. A new search was carefully made, without result. The baggage men were called in and the boxes were accurately described to them. They said that no such boxes had been put aboard with the luggage and this boat!
>
> Now Dr. Scofield and his wife prayed earnestly together. And then it "occurred" to him that it might be worth while to search among the luggage of the emigrants in that boat. This search was now made, in the steerage, and there the boxes were found, safe and sound.[30]

The conflict between the relation by Gaebelein and that given to Trumbull leads us to suggest that the story of the missing boxes could have originated during the interviewing of Scofield by Trumbull.

After the Scofields arrived in the United States, with the notebooks safe, they stopped in New York for a few days, then traveled to Ashuelot. Crestwood Camp was still a camp. The Scofields were joined by Ella Pohle. Cyrus, Hettie and Ella again shared a tent. A small workshop had been erected and there the immeasurably valuable boxes of manuscript were stored. A second, smaller tent was the spot where the actual work was carried on.

On a Sunday morning in May 1907, the three were working in the small tent.[31] They heard a cracking noise. They rushed out and found the main tent—the living quarters—on fire. The tent and contents were destroyed. The fire burned itself out without endangering the work tent or the shed where the boxes of manuscript were stored.

Trumbull states that the fire occurred on Hettie's birthday.[32] However, the sequence in which the incident is narrated places it in May 1907. Legal documents establish that Hettie's birthday was actually October 7.[33] At the time of the fire, she was just past the middle of her 48th year. Possibly the fire made Scofield think again. Possibly, being nearly 64, he found tent life a bit rugged. In June 1907, he decided to leave Ashuelot. He selected the conference grounds at Lake Orion, Michigan, as a spot to continue his labors.

CHAPTER 28 NOTES

1. Gaebelein, *op. cit.*, p. 344; *(Moody Monthly,* Feb. 1943).
2. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 95.
3. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 75, based on church records and Trumbull.
4. Gaebelein appears to have written his sketch without careful reading of Trumbull.
5. Reproduced in type in *Moody Monthly,* Feb. 1943, p. 344.
6. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

7. The letter was photographically reproduced in *Moody Monthly,* Oct. 1942, and also in the booklet edition of the story. No reader of the sketch noted the discrepancy produced by the inclusion of the letter.
8. Gaebelein, *op. cit.,* p. 344.
9. *Ibid.,* p. 345.
10. BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 77.
11. Listed by both Trumbull and BeVier, also referred to by Gaebelein. The authoritative listing is on the title page of The Scofield Reference Bible.
12. Gaebelein, *op. cit.,* p. 344. BeVier, p. 77, refers to Gaebelein but has the correspondence with Weston, not Erdman. No doubt Scofield corresponded with both and with the others as well.
13. BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 77.
14. Compare Trumbull, pp. 94 and 96, to note the conflict.
15. Sheldon Vanauken, *A Severe Mercy,* Harper, 1977, p. 79.
16. Trumbull, *op. cit.,* pp. 97-98. Note that BeVier *on* p. 78 speaks of "The Oxford University Library." There is no Oxford Library as such. No doubt Scofield obtained a ticket to the famous Bodelian. There are numerous other libraries in the "City of Bells."
17. So says Gilbert Highet in *The Immortal Profession,* p. 149, Weybright and Talley, New York, 1976. Highet does tie the eccentricity with brilliance.
18. *The Dallas Morning News,* Monday, November 28, 1921, p. 7.
19. Trumbull, *op. cit.,* p. 98.
20. *Ibid.,* p. 97.
21. *Ibid.,* p. 103.
22. Rev. David Fountain of Southampton, England. From an Address at the Annual Meeting of the Trinitarian Bible Society at Jarvis Baptist Church, Toronto, 1977. Reproduced in *The Gospel Witness,* vol. 59, No. 19, Dec. 8, 1977, p. 12.
23. The Trinitarian Bible Society Record.
24. *A History of Greater Dallas and Vicinity,* 1909, Vol. 11, p. 282.
25. Trumbull, *op. cit.,* p. 78.
26. *Ibid.,* p. 101.
27. *Ibid.,* p. 110.
28. Mr. Bonsor resides on the Island of Jersey at Petit Port, Corbiere.
29. Letter to the writer, November 30, 1976.
30. Trumbull, *op. cit.,* pp. 110-111. If the letter which Gaebelein reproduced on p. 344 of *Moody Monthly* (see above) would be dated 1907 instead of 1906, it would demolish the story of the temporary misplacing of the boxes of notebooks. A 1926 newspaper story about Scofield to be referred to later, related the missing notebooks story in such a way as to weaken its credibility.
31. Trumbull, *op. cit.,* p. 122.
32. *Ibid.*
33. The Death Certificate, New York State Department of Health.

CHAPTER 29

Accepted by Oxford

"Wisdom is the principle thing,; therefore get wisdom and with all thy getting get understanding."

Prov. 4:7

When Scofield left Ashuelot in early June 1907 for Lake Orion, he went via New York. There on June 5, 1907, Scofield signed the most important agreement he made in his entire life, the contract with Oxford University Press for the publication of The Scofield Reference Bible.

Scofield presumably spent most of Wednesday, June 5, at the Oxford University Press office at 156 Fifth Avenue and in the company of Mr. Armstrong. The contract he signed read:

5th June, 1907.

Dear Dr. Scofield,

It is agreed between us that the Oxford University Press is to produce and publish at its own expense your Annotated Edition of the Bible, Authorized Version, with your new system of references, and that we are to secure copyright in England and America in our own name and assign it to you. In the first instance the book is to be set up and printed in America in 8vo size, the type and arrangement of the pages to conform as nearly as possible to the larger specimen page set up at Oxford which you have approved.

The agreement shall remain in force during the continuance of the copyright, or for such shorter period as you and our Mr. Armstrong may arrange, it being understood in the latter event, that you will take over the stock and plates at a valuation at the end, and pay such other expenses that may not have been recouped.

Your royalty is to be 1/- per copy of all copies sold in cloth binding and 1/6 per copy on all copies sold in leather binding until the total number sold amounts to 25,000, after which the royalty payable will be at the rate of 1/3 per copy for cloth and 2/- per copy for leather. No royalties shall be paid on copies given away for review of other purposes.

Should a demand be found to exist for an edition in a size other than 8vo, we shall be at liberty to produce it at our own risk and expense and shall pay you such royalty as shall be mutually arranged.

The question of an edition de luxe, to consist of not more than 1000 copies and to be printed with wide margins on writing paper from the plates of the 8vo edition, is to be arranged between yourself and our Mr. Armstrong.

You will guarantee that the matter incorporated in your book is in no way whatever a violation of any existing copyright, and that will indemnify us from all suits, claims and proceedings, damages and costs,

which may be made, taken or incurred by or against us on the ground that the work is an infringement of copyright.

Accounts had better be made up annually at March, 31 and rendered to you (or at your direction) within six weeks of that date, and the balance of royalty then due can be paid to you by June 15. But an approximate return of sales for the first half of each financial year (April 1 to September 30) will be sent to you during October in each year, and royalty can be paid upon the sales shown by such a return by November 15 in each year.

Yours very truly,
(Signed) HY. FROWDE.

This provisional agreement is accepted by Dr. Scofield.
(Signed) C. I. SCOFIELD[1]

After Scofield signed, the original of the agreement had to be sent to London for the signature of Henry Frowde.

It is interesting to note that despite the enthusiastic response reported from the 1904 meeting in the Press headquarters in London, no formal agreement was made until the signing of June 5, 1907. But in 1904, the Bible was still little more than an idea. There was nothing substantial enough to justify the Press making any commitment of either intent or resources.

The Press had a very hard-headed policy in selecting books for publication. The existence of the notebooks by 1907 may have been something sufficiently tangible to meet the requirements of management. But Scofield's whole program after the 1904 meeting suggests that he had substantial assurance from someone that Oxford would be the publisher.

At this point some consideration should be given to the implications of Oxford University selecting for its list a basically sectarian work which the Scofield Reference Bible turned out to be. Trumbull referred to Oxford University Press as a "Bible-publishing house." While this was the original major role of the American branch, it was in no way adequate to describe the Press as a whole. A. M. Hadfield, who was at Oxford University Press in the days of Charles Williams, describes the organization and concept of the Press:

> . . . Henry Frowde was head of the London Branch of the firm as the Publisher. At Oxford was the Clarendon Press, Charles Cannan and Horace Hart were the doubleheaded god as Secretary to the Delegates, the Printer to the University. The Delegates were an unknown band of great members of the University, felt by ordinary humans in the firm to be related to the Medes and Persians and quite unfathomably obscurantist, to whom in a yearly meeting the existence of every new publication had to be justified in its cash return. But for that return, we used to doubt if the Delegates, had they existed, would have countenanced the publication of the Bible. . . .
>
> The Press was concerned with the publication and sale of learning and literature. It had among its staffmen who were interested in learning and literature, who recognized an intellectual quality when they met it.[2]

The connection between the Press and the University are plainly stated by Hadfield. While the atmosphere at Oxford, its bells and Gothic towers, suggest godliness, the teaching at the University has placed it in the forefront for the dissemination of sophisticated and humanistic ideas completely opposed to those suggested by Dispensationalism. Its normal bias would be and has been in directions opposite to that of The Scofield Reference Bible and to many of the statements in the notes.

It was the essential incongruity of this work being published by Oxford that impelled this writer to follow the trail of Scofield—man and Bible. Robert L. Pierce, pursuing a similar but not identical line of research, had a similar question. Pierce said of the publication of the Scofield Bible by the Oxford University Press:

> Informed patriots know the important part played by Oxford University in the promotion and spreading of Fabian Socialism n both England the America.[3] The fact that a university so saturated with the ideology of Godless collectivism should have published, and should continue to publish even today, a Bible which purports to uphold fundamental Christianity, should provide any Americanist with food for thought. Scofield, who apparently had never before published anything except one small book and some pamphlets and tracts, seemed to have amazingly easy entree into one of the most prestigious and exclusive publishing houses in the English-speaking world.[4]

Incidentally, the ready access of Robert Scott to Oxford University Press may be another indication that the Brethren "separation" based on II Corinthians 6:14 was something for the rank and file. The upper echelon laid it aside when convenient. When it was not laid aside, it was both awkward and far from edifying to those outside the camp.[5]

Brethren contacts or not, we cannot in any way consider that the publication of a sectarian work like The Scofield Bible was a return to faith in Biblical integrity. The men at the Press kept their counsels and, as we shall see, by the acceptance of the contract, picked a cash winner.

On June 25, Scofield, by now settled in at the Lake Orion Conference grounds, wrote Gaebalein regarding the contract. Gaebalein reproduced the text of the letter in 1943:

> After much delay, for which, though unwittingly, I was alone responsible, I followed dear Brother Ball's counsel and closed an arrangement with the Oxford University Press direct, for the publication of our new Bible. They put their own capital into it, and organization back of it. Both Mr. Frowde in England and Mr. Armstrong in New York are very enthusiastic about it. I feel sure everything their capital, wide experience, and the best trade facilities can do to insure its wide circulation will be done. The proofs are to be sent here. I am turning down all invitations and shall devote the summer to this work alone.[6]

The signing of the contract meant that Scofield had to buckle down and produce. Lake Orion had been selected because he hoped that he would be free from the interruptions which had occurred in Dallas because of his dual role.[7]

But he had already become too well known. He was plagued with interruptions from conference attendees. (Conference habituees were known in those days to come up with serious questions like "Is Kaiser Bill the Anti-Christ?" or "Where did Cain get his wife?") It reached a point where Scofield seriously considered returning to Montreux so that he could work without interruption.

He gave up the idea of another trip to Europe and went to Dallas in October. For the first time in a number of years, he presided over a meeting of the church's Joint Boards.[8] His whereabouts and the scope of activity on the Bible, even the location of the notebooks for the rest of 1907, are not readily determined from available sources.

Scofield was in Dallas for the annual meeting of First Church in 1908. As a pleasant contrast to previous years, he delivered his annual report in person. But, of course, most of his activities had little direct relation to First Church and its local ministry. Scofield commended Carroll's work as associate. Incidentally, it was noted that the membership figure again topped 500—all of them, no doubt, anxiously anticipating the Rapture.[9] The report included reference to the work of the Latin American Mission. Note was made of the fact that the Bible Correspondence Course had 5,000 students, around the world. All 5,000 were learning of the prospect of a failing, irrelevant Bride of Christ.[10] The report also stated:

> I believe the new edition of the Scriptures which we are about to give to the church and the world is incomparably the most blessed work which the grace of God ever gave us to do.[11]

In the report, difficulties with the Congregational denomination were noted—the Fundamentalist-Modernist controversy was reaching the simmering stage. Scofield also noted the likelihood of future absences from the church. Such absences were to be expected as the actual production of the Bible got underway. He was back in New York by the end of January.

The work on the Bible was now reaching the place where serious technical matters in the area of the competence of the printing trades had to be decided. The type face was selected. The actual type was imported from the Clarendon Press, Oxford, England, a functional division of the Oxford University Press.[12]

Cyrus and Hettie took an apartment at 21 Fort Washington Ave., New York, and used it as a base for their work.[13] Cyrus, no doubt, traveled between the apartment and the Oxford University Press Office

via the new IRT Subway, using the 155th St. Station. Those much traveled notebooks, originally prepared by Hettie, were cut up, and about twenty pages at a time, were sent to the DeVinne Press for composition. The galleys were checked by DeVinne's proofreaders, a task absolutely crucial and one difficult to handle. With four to six incompatible type styles on each page, checking of the layout was equally important to the checking of spelling and punctuation.[14]

As winter turned to spring and spring to summer, DeVinne's typesetters worked and proofreaders checked the galleys. Along with the originals they were returned to Scofield. Trumbull tells us that all were checked line by line by Cyrus and Hettie.[15] The summer of 1908 was unusually hot.[16] During even the "dog days," Hettie would read from the original copy as Cyrus read the galleys and corrected where necessary. According to Trumbull, the "days" usually lasted from 5 a.m. until it was too dark to see at night. But the task was so stupendous—was it really possible for the Scofields to cover the whole work in the course of a hot summer? (Accustomed as we are to air conditioning, it is almost impossible to imagine conditions in a New York apartment house in that extremely hot summer!)

But Scofield did not keep as close to the task as has been inferred by some. Trumbull notes his relationship with the consulting editors:

> In addition to a great deal of correspondence with these consulting editors, three meetings of the group were held; and one can well imagine what interesting conferences these meetings must have been. The last of the three, reviewing the whole work, was held at Princeton, New Jersey, when several of the editorial board spent many days together, with access to the great theological library there.[17]

While those sessions were being held, he was not proofreading.

He did reject one request for writing which would have taken time from work on the Bible. Lyman Stewart, one of the founders of the Union Oil Company of California, which today markets petroleum products under the orange and blue UNION 76 emblem, was a vigorous supporter of Dispensational causes. He contributed to Scofield's work on The Scofield Reference Bible. During the summer of 1908, he wrote Scofield, suggesting that Scofield prepare a study or lengthy essay defending the Fundamental faith from the attacks of modern infidelity. Scofield replied that his work on the Reference Bible precluded other activities at the moment.[18]

In the Lyman Stewart papers at Biola College, Los Angeles, there is a letter of Scofield's written on the letterhead of Grove City College, Grove City, Pennsylvania, on August 7, 1908. The letter reads:

> My Dear Mr. Stewart:
>
> We have just closed the first conferences of Christian scholars in review of my editorial work on the new edition of the Scriptures, and it

> certainly has been a most profitable week. We went minutely over the Four Gospels, & my work thereon, adding, clarifying, modifying. The brethren gathered were Prof. W. G. Moorehead, United Pres. Theo. Seminary of Xenia, Ohio, Prof. Chas. R. Erdman of Princeton Theo. Sem., and Dr. W. J. Erdman, the well known expositor.
>
> I was much encouraged, & wish I could believe all the kind things these learned brethren said as to the great good which the new Bible will do.
>
> The next conference is to be held here, the last week in August, & the last at Princeton, N. J. in September—both with different groups of brethren of different denominations.
>
> Your kind and generous gift will, I am sure, cover the expense of all this, including some modest compensation to the brethren.
>
> Thank you in our Lord's precious name.
>
> Yours sincerely
> C. I. Scofield[19]

The list of brethren attending the two subsequent conferences have not come to light, and we have no idea exactly what changes might have been made in the notes even as press date was approaching. The conferences, while referred to by Trumbull, have been largely unnoticed. When the Bible was published Scofield did include a list of consulting editors, including the men he had conferred with in 1908.[20]

Sandeen comments:

> Just what role these consulting editors played in the project has been the subject of some confusion. Apparently Scofield only meant to gain support for his publication from both sides of the millenarian movement with this device.[21]

In a letter to Sandeen, written after his (Sandeen's) work was published, Wilbur M. Smith stated that he (Smith) had spent a good deal of time trying to discover some relevant material on the editorial group and its work. His search ended in total failure. He had even written to descendants of the group for any relevant correspondence. Replies were all in the negative.[22]

The mystery of the Scofield Reference Bible remains. And despite the list of editors, the impression has been promoted that The Scofield Reference Bible was largely the work of one man. Both the Dispensational hierarchy and the publisher have helped to build this illusion.

In a pamphlet issued by Oxford University Press in 1959 and written by Dr. Frank E. Gaebelein (A. C.'s son), the legend is promoted:

> Although the Scofield Reference Bible was so largely the work of one man, it was not, as we have seen, produced in isolation.[23]

Seven years later, Frank Gaebelein was to say:

> But Dr. Scofield's consultants gave him much helpful advice, the Reference Bible was *not* a group effort. In fact, his achievement was largely his own, for he did his work almost single-handed. His was a ground-breaking

> effort and in the history of Bible annotations it occupies a distinctive place.[24]

Scofield's image was always fragile and any boost was helpful.

Conferences, correspondence and all that aside, progress must have been made on the magnum opus. On October 23, 1908, Scofield wrote Gaebelein:

> My dear Brother:
>
> Yours to hand. As to the date of publication—the typesetters are in John, but are going very rapidly now, and I expect to get through here in about three weeks. The book will not, however, be issued till January[15]. The publisher fixes that date. He is importing the paper for both editions, the ordinary Bible paper and the India. It certainly is going to be beautiful from a typographical point of view. I shall go home for a few weeks after I finish here, but expect to be in the East and Middle West after January till March, then the Pacific Coast. Many invitations are coming in. Will send you schedule in December. We ought to get together in some, or most, of these meetings.
>
> With every best wish,
>
> Yours as ever,
> Scofield[25]

We suggest that some of the letter was intended more for publication or to impress future readers than for actual transmission of current information. Some points are a bit improbable in the light of the actual production schedule. If the typesetters were working on John, following straight textual order, there remained after John, 212 pages to be set and corrected. Scofield claimed that he would be able to depart from New York in about three weeks (about November 15). Correcting that many pages, along with Scofield's other concerns would be difficult. Further, three major holidays loomed ahead. They would mean suspension of publication work by all the printing trades.

The reference to the India paper seems unlikely. India paper for Bibles is not produced like newsprint. A house like Oxford would normally need to have a steady flow of India paper arranged to keep presses rolling. This may be another comment designed for future readers.

The facts were more probably:

1. The typesetters were working on the Gospel of John to fit in the corrections resulting from the conferences in Grove City and Princeton.
2. The production schedule could accommodate the changes because of the decision to start each book of the Bible on a new page, regardless of amount of open spaces left. Thus most of the Old Testament had been printed and the folios were in a warehouse or at the binders waiting for collation when all the pages were completed.

3. Only a small part of the opus remained to be worked on, thus the scheduled publication date would be met.

BeVier, commenting on the travel notes in the October 23 letter, seems to think Scofield meant New Hampshire.[26] That assumption overlooks Scofield's own statement in the letter and would be valid only if a permanent building had been erected. New Hampshire is no place for a 65-year-old man to live in a tent in December. BeVier was unaware that Scofield had reacquired 157 Holmes Avenue, Dallas.

Trumbull relates the following incident, suggesting that it occurred in 1908 (probably before November 15):

> One day a friend met Dr. Scofield in New York, by appointment, upon another matter, and they went together for a walk on Fifth Avenue. The friend asked concerning the progress of the work on the Reference Bible. Dr. Scofield abruptly came to a full stop in their walk as he said: "At eleven o'clock last night I came upon those impressive words, 'The End.' Yes, the work is finished—that is, in the sense in which any human work can ever be finished; for I am confident that there is only one work ever undertaken upon this earth which has in an absolute sense been finished, to which nothing can ever be added and from which nothing can be taken away. That is the finished work of Christ."[27]

Production schedules could be maintained in those days. The Scofield Reference Bible, original edition, was officially published January 15, 1909.[28] With its publication, the idea of church failure and irrelevancy and hopeless decay for the world was on its way to evangelical respectability.

CHAPTER 29 NOTES

1. The original contract was incorporated into the contract for the 1917 edition. The entire contract is in the papers of the Scofield Estate file, Surrogates Office, Queens County, Jamaica, New York.
2. A. M. Hadfield, *An Introduction to Charles Williams.*
3. See Martin L. Rose, *Fabian Freeway,* Western Island, Boston and Los Angeles, 1966.
4. Robert L. Pierce, *The Rapture Cult,* Signal Mountain Press, Signal Mountain, Tennessee, 1978, p. 50.
5. Typical view of "Brethren" in high places was noted by Hamilton Ellis in his history of the London and Southwestern Railway. His picture shows one of the less edifying aspects of Brethrenism: "Godfrey Knight was secretary of the company from 1898 to 1922. One of the more austere sort of Plymouth Brethren, he would never attend any social function." *The South Western Railway* by C. Hamilton Ellis, George Allen & Unwin, London, 1956, p. 206.
6. Reproduced in type in *Moody Monthly.* Apparently among the Scofield letters in the "Gaebelein" collection.
7. Trumbull, *op. cit.,* p. 109.
8. Secretary's Book of Board of Elders, First Church, Dallas, October 17, 1907, Mss.
9. Pastor's Report to the Congregation for 1907.
10. *Ibid.*
11. *Ibid.*

12. Clarendon Press is the working, functional portion of Oxford University Press, actually doing the printing in the British Isles. See "A Little Quincentenary History, 1478-1978", Oxford University Press.
13. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 113.
14. Note almost any page of The Scofield Reference Bible.
15. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 113.
16. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 112, confirmed from weather pages of *The New York Times* by the General Humanities Division, The New York Public Library.
17. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 99.
18. Thanks to Ernest Sandeen who, in preparation for *The Roots of Fundamentalism,* examined the Lyman Stewart papers at Biola College.
19. Original in the Lyman Stewart papers, Biola College.
20. The list was published on the title page of the Bible.
21. Sandeen, *op. cit.*, p. 224.
22. Letter to Ernest R. Sandeen, Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn., from Wilbur M. Smith at 2490 Ridgeway Road, San Marino, Calif., August 31, 1970.
23. Frank E. Gaebelein, *The Story of the Scofield Reference Bible,* New York, Oxford University Press, p. 14.
24. Frank E. Gaebelein, The *New Scofield Reference Bible,* New York, 1967, Oxford University Press, p. 15.
25. A. C. Gaebelein, *op. cit.*, p. 400, *(Moody Monthly).*
26. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 81.
27. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, p. 14.
28. It was the first book to be originated by the Oxford University Press, American branch. See "A Little Quincentennary History," p. 14.

CHAPTER 30

The Scofield Reference Bible

> *"Every word of God is pure; he is a shield unto them that put their trust in Him. Add thou not unto His words lest he reprove thee; and thou be found a liar."*
>
> Proverbs 30:5,6

Into an America which delighted in Theodore Roosevelt's *Strenuous Life,* Thorstein Veblen, Peter Finley Dunne's *Mr. Dooley,* Ida Tarbell and the International Correspondence School, came The Scofield Reference Bible. It was a day in which people expected quick learning and quick fixes for social ills. It was assumed that cramming facts into the brain could provide easy access to knowledge and culture without interrupting the necessitous areas of life. While its end philosophy set it off from most other cultural innovations of the day, The Scofield Reference Bible's methodology fit quite easily into the milieu of The Progressive Era.

Several years later, Charles G. Trumbull said that Scofield was convinced that people want to study the Bible, but did not know how. Because of this, Scofield:

> . . . saw that if his Bible studies were to be of the widest usefulness they would need to be attached to the Word itself—and in a form not too bulky.[1]

Thus was the form of The Scofield Reference Bible determined. But in his method, Scofield was not original. Albertus Pieters, the first serious critic of Scofield, noted:

> To be sure, this has been done before, as in the great Dutch "Staten Bijbel"; but that method has passed out of use, precisely because it was recognized that fallible interpretation should not thus be associated with infallible revelation. It was a clever idea of Dr. Scofield thus to revive it. Had his notes been published separately, by themselves, as a commentary, they would by this time have been forgotten.[2]

Linking comment and text for convenient reference in the course of study is acceptable if, and only if, the work is offered as a commentary. Otherwise it is neither sound nor intellectually honest.

Matthew Henry, who is a "bad boy" of prophetic interpretation to many Dispensationalists, did link text and comment. But his five volumes have always been offered as a commentary on the entire Bible and have covered the whole Sacred Library, not select portions. Albert

Barnes, Philadelphia Presbyterian of the 1830's, issued comprehensive notes which included the text of Scripture. But neither Henry nor Barnes had the temerity, guile or gall to get their notes accepted as Scripture itself.[3] Matthew Henry and Barnes have other merits not found in Scofield. But as we shall see, the idea has been firmly planted in the Dispensational camp even today.[4]

Harry A. Ironside, a leading Dispensationalist who pastored Moody Memorial Church, Chicago, said:

> Alas, how ready are well-meaning people to put the ministry of human teachers in the place of the Holy Scriptures, and almost unconsciously begin "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."[5]

Unfortunately, Ironside never realized that his indictment could be applied to the very system he spent his life defending and propagating.

In looking at Scofield's finished work, other serious questions arise. For instance, did the project take seven years? The question is important if Scofield was actually the scholar he is touted as being. His ideas had been formulated (or handed to him) at an early point in his ministry. He had been teaching the ideas for years. His correspondence course had been along the lines taken by his notes. The Brethren, whom Scofield claimed as spiritual forebearers, had produced a bulk of material which could have been culled to produce the notes.

The 66 heading summaries for the individual books as placed in The Scofield Reference Bible are strictly in line with the thinking of the Brethren and Dispensational movements. No great amount of research should have been required. A fairly ample culling of Brethren writings should have sufficed.

The crux of Scofield's Reference system should be the Reference comments placed on the pages of text. As noted just above, Scofield indicated via Trumbull that these were absolutely necessary to his theology. This necessity makes a page count of his material most revealing.

Of course, all text on every single page of the Bible may not require the same amount of extended comment. The population lists in Numbers, for example, are properly passed over without discussion in general commentaries. But, to find, as we do, that 781 pages out of the total 1,353 in Scofield's work lack comment, suggests that we are dealing with something highly selective and subjective. Interestingly enough, there are four books in the two Testaments which in the Scofield tome have no comment except for the heading summaries.

An indication of the bias of Scofield's system is noted in the page-study of the four Gospels. It is a point of faith in Dispensationalism that the first Gospel is primarily Jewish in emphasis, thus of limited value today, if not actually *verboten* to the church. But Scofield was

ostensibly, being in advance of The Rapture, addressing the non-jewish redeemed. Thus, it should have been logical for him to have concentrated on the other Gospels of "non-Jewish" emphasis.

The page count, presented below, shows that Scofield placed comment on only 39 pages, total, in the "non-jewish" Gospels, only four in the Gospel of Mark. In contrast, he produced 48 pages with comment in the "Jewish" Gospel of Matthew which some of his extreme followers say Christians are not to use.

Mention has been made of Scofield's report to Lyman Stewart regarding the week-long session at Grove City College with the Erdmans and others going through notes and making comments on the References on the Gospel pages.[6] Did the Erdmans grasp the unbalance to which we refer? Did they realize the inconsistency between comment and theology?

Before presenting the specific page count, it might be well to clear the air on the matter of Matthew's Gospel with some words from J. Gresham Machen:

> It is widely held that this Gospel is addressed particularly to the Jews. Its Jewish destination appears, for example, in the peculiar prominence which it assigns to the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy in the events of the life of Jesus, and also, perhaps, in certain answers which it seems to give to specific Jewish attacks.
>
> Exaggerations, indeed, should be avoided at this point. On the one hand, all of the Gospels—not merely this Gospel—are interested in the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecy; and on the other hand, this Gospel is certainly not Jewish in the sense that it stands in any disagreement with the principles of the Gentile mission in the early Church or in the sense that it obtrudes into the history in any disturbing way its answers to Jewish attacks.[7]

The page count for the entire work as tabulated shows:

Book	*Total Pages*	*Pages with Comment*	*More than 2' Comment*	*Less than 2' Comment*	*Pages with no Comment*
Genesis	67	39	14	25	28
Exodus	54	28	5	23	26
Leviticus	38	22	4	18	16
Numbers	49	17	0	17	32
Deuteronomy	49	11	0	11	38
Joshua	27	7	0	7	20
Judges	27	3	0	3	24
Ruth	4	0	0	0	4
I Samuel	35	2	0	2	33
II Samuel	29	5	1	4	24
I Kings	35	3	0	3	32
II Kings	35	1	0	1	34
I Chronicles	34	4	0	4	30

Book	*Total Pages*	*Pages with Comment*	*More than 2′ Comment*	*Less than 2′ Comment*	*Pages with no Comment*
II Chronicles	38	3	0	3	35
Ezra	12	4	0	4	8
Nehemiah	17	3	0	3	14
Esther	9	0	0	0	9
Job				9	21
Psalms	72	25	1	24	47
Proverbs	23	2	0	2	21
Ecclesiastes	9	2	0	2	7
Canticles	5	4	0	4	1
Isaiah	59	31	1	30	28
Jeremiah	62	21	0	21	41
Lamentations	6	1	0	1	5
Ezekiel	58	14	0	14	44
Daniel	23	21	5	16	2
Hosea	9	3	0	3	6
Joel	4	4	1	3	0
Amos	7	4	0	4	3
Obadiah	2	0	0	0	2
Jonah	3	2	0	2	1
Micah	6	5	1	4	1
Nahum	3	1	1	0	2
Habakkuk	4	3	1	2	1
Zephaniah	3	2	0	2	1
Haggai	3	1	0	1	2
Zechariah	15	15	5	10	0
Malachi	5	5	2	3	0
Old Testament Total		327			643

Book	*Total Pages*	*Pages with Comment*	*More than 2′ Comment*	*Less than 2′ Comment*	*Pages with No Comment*
Matthew	52	48	20	28	4
Mark	24	4	0	4	20
Luke	43	17	1	16	26
John	32	18	2	16	14
Acts	44	21	3	18	23
Romans	19	13	4	9	6
I Corinthians	18	14	3	11	4
II Corinthians	11	4	0	4	7
Galatians	8	8	2	6	0
Ephesians	8	7	1	6	1
Philippians	5	2	0	2	3
Colossians	5	3	0	3	2
I Thessa-	4	3	0	3	1
II lonians					

Book	*Total Pages*	*Pages with Comment*	*More than 2' Comment*	*Less than 2' Comment*	*Pages with No Comment*
II Thessalonians	3	1	0	1	2
I Timothy	5	2	0	2	3
II Timothy	4	3	0	3	1
Titus	3	1	0	1	2
Philemon	2	1	0	1	1
Hebrews	15	10	1	9	5
James	5	2	0	2	3
I Peter	6	4	0	4	2
II Peter	4	3	0	3	1
I John	5	3	0	3	2
II John	1	1	0	1	0
III John	1	0	0	0	1
Jude	2	2	0	2	0
Rovelation	23	19	6	13	4
New Testament Total		214			138

The tabulation suggests that the great work of *C.* I. Scofield is hardly a reliable commentary on the Bible. Yet, it has been accepted by millions as a fully adequate source of help, illumination and information.

Trumbull was to say of Scofield:

> The man who gave his lifetime study to the making of notes and comments in the Scofield Reference Bible *was concerned to find and state exactly what the Bible itself had to say* on any and every point.[8]

That statement is not quite correct. When we looked at certain Bible portions of matters of practical everyday significance, we found gaping omissions. Possible more than coincidentally, verses which deal with breaches of some moral and/or civil laws, breaches which occurred in the course of Scofield's life, are not commented on.

Date	**Offense**	**Scripture Passage**	**Page In SRB (1917)**	**Lines of Comment**
1873	False oath of Office	Lev. 6:3 Hos. 10:14 Ps.24:4	132 927 610	
1874	Bribes	Amos 5:12 Isa.26:10	937 611	
1874	Failure to provide for his own	I Tim. 5:8	1276	
1877	Fraud and forgery	Lev. 19:13	151	

Date	Offense	Scripture Passage	Page In SRB (1917)	Lines of Comment
1879	Failure to pay promissory note	Lev. 6:2	132	
1883	Divorce	Deut. 24:1-4 Matt. 5:31,32 Matt. 19:3-7 Mark 10:2-9	242 1001 1025 1058	
1892	False degree	Prov. 19:5	685	
1902	False story about war decoration	Prov. 19:6	685	
1909	Adding to the Word of God	Prov. 30:5,6	685	

Consider the significance of the complete blank of the last column of the chart. Scofield, in his Introduction, dated Jan. 1, 1909, claimed that his "Bible" contained ". . . the elements which must combine to facilitate the study and intelligent use of the Bible. . . ."[9] He goes on to say that these elements ". . . became clear in his mind."

Possibly Scofield did not consider that intelligent use of the Bible included application to practical affairs of life. Or was it possible that he wanted to avoid calling attention to the fact that there had been problem areas in his life? For instance, his marital status was contrary to the accepted position in Dispensational circles in 1909. Had he commented according to the accepted position, his comments would have been belied by his own status. To comment according to the facts of his life would have destroyed his position as a commentator. So avoid, avoid, avoid.

But this brings up another aspect of the Dispensational position. The movement has frequently spoken of being "free from the law." In theological terms, this is called antinomianism. Simply it means that being saved, thanks to free grace, one does not need to be particular about moral behaviour.

As we look through the papers, we find that Scofield appears to have "'worked both sides of the street" on the issue. For instance, in a letter written April 2, 1889, to Rev. J. B. Clark of the Congregational society, Scofield, speaking of the need to expand Christian work in Texas, said:

> Nothing can be more certain than that this opportunity to plant the tree that bears the fruit of godliness, loyalty, and obedience to law, will not wait. Already San Antonio and Fort Worth are lost to us. The questions all feel to be unsettled—questions, too, fraught with the most awful possibilities—confront this generation. How unspeakably wicked, then, to neglect the chance God is offering us to create, in the South itself, a sound and righteous public sentiment concerning them.[10]

But obedience to the Law is contrary to Brethren Dispensational teaching. What did Scofield mean?

A work of 1913, *No Room in The Inn,* might suggest a development in thought. There Scofield says:

> So long as we regard the law as fatherly advice, or as mere ideal to be striven toward, trusting meanwhile on the vague mercy of God to overlook our shortcomings, and to accept our good intentions in the place of perfect obedience, we are steeling our consciences against the very work the law set to do.[11]

But two years later, in 1915, in *The New Life in Christ Jesus,* we find him saying:

> The believer is told that he is not under law, that is, a system of probation to see if he can work out a righteousness for himself, but under grace, that is, a system of divine inworking, which produces the very righteousness which the law required, but which man never achieved.[12]

Commenting on the very first verse of the Bible, Scofield introduces error. Note 2 (page 3) refers to the word "create" (Bara) in Genesis 1:1. Scofield states in his note: ". . . the first creative act refers to the dateless past and gives scope for all the geologic ages." This statement accommodates to evolutionary theory.

Such an "opening to the left" is another evidence that Scofield was neither an original nor a deep thinker. Here he was accepting a popular view which attempted to effect a compromise between the Biblical record and the alleged science of Charles Darwin.[13]

The theistic evolutionists in the Neo-Evangelical camp accepted evolution without the benefit of Scofield. But the presence of Note 2 in the "Bible" must have made them feel much more comfortable with their compromise. The note also made the folks in the pews feel more like accommodating to the science of periodicals like *TIME* and *Newsweek.* Some Dispensationalists did not remain creationists. But the implications of Scofield's Note 2 make their position just a bit untenable.

The late Wilbur M. Smith noted that even though The Scofield Reference Bible had been the greatest means of promoting millenarianism, there is not a word about "millennium" in the Scofield notes at Revelation 20. Smith considered this a strange phenomenon.[14] In a service of eulogy to Scofield in Dallas, on November 28, 1921, Dr. Irving Carroll, one of Scofield's students commented on this point, even though Smith appeared to be unaware of it. Carroll said:

> In his writings he (Scofield) was careful of his choice of words and used those that delicately balanced with his meanings. The word millennium is a perfectly good Biblical word (sic) and yet you will not find it used by Dr. *(sic)* Scofield. It suggests controversial aspects, so he always employed the word "kingdom."[15]

Scofield's views in so many places seem to downgrade the integrity of the Word of God. For instance, on page 1,252 (Ephesians 3) he says: "In his (Paul's) writings alone we find the doctrine, position, walk, and destiny of the Church." Such a statement contradicts II Tim. 3:16 and is the basis for the ultradispensational heresy that most of the Bible is of no use to the church in the present day. (Of course, there are many who claim a place in the church who so act.)[16]

Speaking of Scofield's work, Yona Malachy of the Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, said:

> The basic element of modern Dispensationalism and that which gave the movement its name, is the belief that human history is divided into well-defined periods (or dispensations) in which God relates to man in different ways. According to the classical definition of C. I. Scofield, one of the movement's leading theologians, a dispensation "is a period of time during which man is tested in respect to obedience to some specific revelation of the will of God. Seven such are distinguished in Scripture."[17]

And this system is an obvious characteristic of The Scofield Reference Bible, or at least Scofield says so. In the Introduction to the 1917 edition, Scofield said:

> The Dispensations are distinguished, exhibiting the majestic, progressive order of the divine dealings of God with humanity,"the increasing purpose", which runs through and links together the ages, from the beginning of the life of man to the end of eternity. Augustine said: Distinguish the ages, and the Scriptures harmonize."[18]

Yet in his work, Scofield does not follow through with the claim he made in the Introduction. When this writer went to his copy of The Scofield Reference Bible, he found that the Dispensations could not in many cases be easily picked out, even from the comment written by Scofield. The notes and even sub-headings gave no clue. In trying to chart the system, interpolation had to be used.

The tabulation, worked out as well as possible, is:

CHART OF DISPENSATIONS

Dispensations by Scofield	*Text*	*Opening Page*	*Closing Page*	*Total Pages*
1. Innocence	Gen. 1:28-3:22	5	10	5
2. Conscience	Gen. 3:22-8:19	10	15	5
3. Human Government	Gen. 8:20-11:32	16	20	4
Promise	Gen. 12:1-Ex. 19:8	20	94	74

But after Dispensation 4 and its preceding "minor" Dispensations, we find a major problem with a major epoch. The Holy Spirit said (via the Apostle Mark): "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God" *(Mark 1.:1)*. If we are to keep our chart in line with Scofield's

thesis, we must disregard the Holy Spirit. We make an assumption for the end of Dispensation 5. The result is:

5. Law	Ex. 19:8-Matt.27:35	94	1041	948
	Mark	1045	1068	23
	Luke	1070	1111	41
	John	1114	1142	28
				1,040

Scofield never quite clearly stated where the Dispensation ends. Nor do other Dispensational scholars. Their judgment does not agree with the Holy Spirit, as most conservative scholars would. To continue our chart effort, we will use Scofield's principles:

6. Church	Acts 1-Rev. 3	1147	1334	287

Having worked through the Church era, we found fourteen pages which cannot properly be fitted into the Dispensational structure:

??	Rev. 4-10	1335	1349	14

If we consider this period a Dispensation in its own right, then the magic "seven" of the system goes out the window. If we consider it a reversion to period five (Law), then some of Scofield's claims are faulted.[19] Then, what do we do with the Millennium?

? Millennium	Rev. 20	1349	1351	3

The final period is:

7. Eternity	Rev. 21-22	1351	1353	2

To recapitulate without comment:

1. Innocence	Gen. 1-28-3:22	5	10	5
2. Conscience	Gen. 3:22-8:19	10	15	5
3. Human Government	Gen. 8:20-11:32	16	20	4
4. Promise	Gen. 12:1-Ex. 19:8	20	94	74
5. Law	Ex. 19:8-Matt. 27:35	94	1041	948
	Mark	1045	1068	23
	Luke	1070	1111	41
	John	1114	1142	28
			1040	
6. Church	Acts 1-Rev. 3	1147	1134	287
? ?	Rev. 4-19	1335	1349	14
? Millenium	Rev. 20	1349	1351	3
7. Eternity	Rev. 21-22	1351	1353	2

The idea that we have tried to chart was inherent in his thought from the very beginning. In a comment on his system, Scofield was to say:

> . . . there is a beautiful system in this gradualness of unfolding. The past is seen to fall into periods, marked off by distinct limits, and distinguishable

> period from period by something peculiar to each. Thus it comes to be understood that there is a doctrine of Ages or Dispensations in the Bible.[20]

But somehow, when this system is put against the actual text of Scripture, even Scofield himself could not make the system and text congruent.

Something else; the verse breaks to which we have become accustomed were placed in the Bible first in English, in the Geneva Bible of 1560. If the breaks alleged by Scofield actually indicate substantial changes in God's dealing with man, is it not strange that the divisions would not have been marked more strikingly before 1560? We cannot down a lurking suspicion that there is a disagreement between Dispensational teaching and the Holy Spirit who inspired the original writers. Note again Mark 1:1: "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ," confirmed in Matthew 11:13: "For all the prophets and the law prophesied until John."

The confusion of Scofield's system grows. In addition to Dispensations for which we find no clear basis in Scripture, Scofield adds a system of Covenants. In his Introduction[21] Scofield states that a Dispensation is a method of testing while a Covenant is everlasting and unconditional. (The blasphemy of binding God who is Holy to unconditional relationships with sinful man is blithely overlooked.)

On his Page 20, Scofield suggests that the Covenant with Noah and the "Third" Dispensation are identical.[22] We hold the idea of the "Third" Dispensation preposterous and can note no substantial change in God's dealing with men at that time. The Palestinian Covenant, noted on page 250 of the SRB and ostensibly based on Deuteronomy 30:3, appears under the Dispensation of Law (referred to by Scofield as a horrible mistake). The confusion is intolerable.

As Norman Kraus says:

> Covenants, at least some of them, have to do not only with man's life on earth, but also with his salvation, while Dispensations apparently do not. As a matter of fact, Scofield's eight Covenants are of different sorts, conditioning both life in this world (see his statement that dispensations "condition human life on earth") and salvation. His lack of consistency on this point makes his notes very difficult to interpret.[23]

With Scofield's lack of formal training and somewhat irregular career, what else could one expect?

The influence of The Scofield Reference Bible resulted from the spread of a revised edition which Scofield made in 1917. Some of its features will be noted in chapter 33. Inadequate or no, Scofield's work received highest praise from those who held to its system. And that praise meant that many in the pew failed to distinguish between the words of Scofield and those of the Holy Spirit:

As the late William E. Cox said:

> Scofield's footnotes and his systematized schemes of hermeneutics have been memorized by many as religiously as have verses of the Bible. It is not at all uncommon to hear devout men recite these footnotes prefaced by the words, "The Bible says. . . ." Many a pastor has lost all influence with members of his congregation and has been branded a liberal for no other reason that failure to concur in all the footnotes of Dr. Scofield. Even many ministers use the teachings of Scofield as tests of orthodoxy! Charles G. Trumbull, late editor of the *Sunday School Times,* spoke of the *Scofield Bible* in the following terms, in his book, *The Life Story of C. I. Scofield:* "God-planned, God-guided, God-energized work."[24]

This writer remembers feeling betrayed when one of his teachers in a Dispensational Bible institute suggested care in accepting Scofield's notes. He created an atmosphere of near shock when he suggested that had Scofield then been living he might have made changes in some of his notes!

So firmly had the Scofield system (in its 1917 form) attached itself to the Fundamentalist community that when a revision was decided on after World War II, the strong Dispensationalists rose as to a call to arms. Pastor Cornelius Stam of Chicago mused:

> Would revision neutralize the dispensational distinctions which Dr. Scofield had brought to light? Would it represent a retreat rather than an advance for dispensational truth? Would it impair the Reference Bible which had brought so much blessing to so many thousands of people?[25]

Stam flooded the Revision Committee with literature which he felt would persuade them to "hold the line." In October 1955, he had his constituency flood the committee with postcards reading in part:

> Since there has been a retreat from Scofield's dispensational teachings among many fundamentalists and we fear that this will affect the revision of the notes in this beloved and God-honored reference Bible, we earnestly beseech you, each one, to READ AT LEAST ONE OF THE ABOVE NAMED BOOKS THOUGHTFULLY AND PRAYERFULLY BEFORE PROCEEDING FURTHER WITH THE REVISION.[26]

Stam feels that his campaign did have some influence.[27] The new product seems to be a remarkably similar work to the 1909 and 1917 issues.

CHAPTER 30 NOTES

1. Trumbull, *op. cit.,* p. 76.
2. *A Candid Examination of the Scofield Bible* by Albertus Pieters, p. 7, originally issued by Douma Publications, Grand Rapids. Now available through Reiner Publications, Swengel, Pa.
3. *Barnes Notes on The New Testament* is now on the list of Kregel Publications, Grand Rapids. Both Henry and Barnes take views of prophecy completely at variance with the views of Darby, Scofield, Gaebelein and Walvoord.
4. Dr. Warren Wiersbe, writing in *Moody Monthly* (column "Insight") issue of Feb. 1977, said: "Annotated editions of the Kings James Bible continue to be published,

and the public buys them. Like makes of cars or brands of toothpaste, each has its promoters and supporters and detractors, almost to the point of making this a test of orthodoxy or spiritual fellowship" (p. 125). The success of the Ryrie and Criswell Bibles confirms his point.

5. H. A. Ironside, *The Four Hundred Silent Tears,* Loizeaux Bros., Neptune, N. J., p. 22. Ironside is speaking about the teaching of the Maccabean period and the Talmud. However, the Scofield system which he encouraged and supported has had a similar effect on the Dispensational constituency.
6. Chapter 30.
7. J. Gresham Machen, *The Virgin Birth of Christ,* pp. 169, 170.
8. Trumbull, *op. cit.,* pp. 80, 81.
9. *Scofield Reference Bible,* Introduction, unnumbered page.
10. Letter of April 2, 1889, to Rev. J. B. Clark in the AHMS Collection. We cannot be entirely sure of the exact concept of "law" Scofield referred to, but in 1889, the distinctions which seem normal today were largely the playthings of theologians. Hence, we do not feel that we are reading into Scofield's letter something not intended.
11. C. I. Scofield, *No Room in The Inn,* Oxford University Press, New York, 1913, p. 14.
12. C. I. Scofield, *The New Life in Christ Jesus,* Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago, 1915, p. 49.
13. In *"Dominion Covenant.: Genesis"* (Institute for Christian Economics, Tyler, Tex., 1982), Gary North noted (p. 392) that the defeat of Orthodox creationism was not an overnight event. There was a steady retreat from 1750 to 1859 when Darwin's work was published. The idea of geologic ages provided most of the impetus for that retreat. Scofield's orthodoxy must be measured by the implications of Note 2, page 3, and in the light of Gary North's statement.
14. Letter, previously referred to from Wilbur M. Smith to Ernest Sandeen August 31, 1970. Except for the following statement the point was not noticed before, and we must wonder why no one noticed it.
15. The service was reported in *The Dallas Morning News of* November 23, 1921. We fail to find that"millennium" is a good Biblical word.
16. This note was quoted with pride in the ultradispensational magazine *The Berean Searchlight,* edited by Cornelius Stam in the January 1987 issue in an article entitled "Collateral Proof" by John Willison. The idea is entirely consistent with the views of the ultra group, and some *not* so "ultra" as well. It makes Christian carnality so much easier.
17. Yona Malachy, *American Fundamentalism and Israel.* The Institute of Contemporary Jewry, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Jerusalem, 1978. Malachy quotes from *The Scofield Reference Bible,* p. 5.
18. Introduction to the *Scofield Reference Bible.*
19. When Scofield spoke at the opening of the Philadelphia School of the Bible in 1914, he said: "You would find this fact invariably true of those great highways through the Bible, that is, those great lines of truth that run through the books, namely, that, beginning with the first emergence of a truth and following chronologically through, the writer, though he may pick up the pen of the inspired writer of one hundred to two hundred years before, carries it on from just where this other writer left it, and it becomes more complete; and you follow the truth, ever growing larger and fuller, until it finally brings you to Christ. Is not that a very remarkable fact, that never once does the writer recur to a more elementary statement, but always carries the truth on and on?" Found in "The Spirit and Method of Bible Study," reprinted with Rev. Wilbur M. Smith's address of the same title in 1939, from page 9. If the seven-year period is a reversion to "Law" it conflicts with Scofield's views as expressed to the Philadelphians.
20. C. I. Scofield, *Addresses on Prophecy,* Chas. C. Cook, New York, 1914, p. 13.

21. *Scofield Reference Bible,* 1917 Edition, Introduction, unnumbered page, paragraphs IX and X.
22. *The Scofield Reference Bible,* 1917, p. 20.
23. C. Norman Kraus, *Dispensationalism in America,* John Knox Press, 1958, p. 119.
24. William E. Cox, *An Examination of Dispensationalism,* Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1974. The quotation is from Appendix, p. 54. It had originally appeared in *The Baptist Leader,* November 1959.
25. Cornelius R. Stam, *The New Scofield Reference Bible, An Appraisal,* Berean Bible Society, Chicago, p. 12.
26. *Ibid.,* p. 16.
27. *Ibid.,* p. 17.

CHAPTER 31

A Touch of Fame

"For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world.: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith."

I John 5:4

The publication of a new edition of the Bible is not celebrated in the manner that publishers and authors announce a new novel. So we have no record of a celebration at 156 Fifth Avenue (Oxford headquarters) on January 15, 1909, when *The Scofield Reference Bible* was officially published. The man who made it possible was not there. By the 13th he was in Dallas, presiding at a business meeting for First Church.[1] While getting the Bible ready for the printer, Scofield had found time to prepare a report on his activities of 1908 for the church.[2]

In the report he expressed a desire to visit the fields where the Central American Mission was laboring.[3] There is, however, no record of a trip to Latin America.

Scofield declared his approval of the decision of the church to withdraw from the Lone Star Association of the Congregational Church.[4] That step was the culmination of a growing difference in point of view. The final break was triggered by the decision of the association to accept Rev. E. F. Maddox as a member of the association. Maddox, who had been dropped by the Presbyterians of the South on doctrinal grounds, was one of the early modernists in the South.

At some time during 1909, Scofield was taken with a bit of pride of accomplishiment. This pride impelled him to send copies of *The Scofield Reference Bible* to each of his girls. Something did not go right. The copy sent to Helene did not arrive. (Post Office troubles are apparently nothing new.) Papa was hard pressed to explain. Note from the letter reproduced just below, that Papa stated a replacement was on the way, and that he had intended no discrimination.

Scofield's neglect of the girls after 1879, and even earlier, particularly the neglect while engaged in "Christian work," was especially heinous in the light of the imperative given Dispensationalists to witness to loved ones outside the camp. In the face of neglect of many years, a gesture after one approaches fame cannot compensate.

The apparent failure of Scofield to witness to his own becomes particularly inconceivable in the face of major differences between Dispensationalism and the official positions of the Roman Catholic

Church. That discrepancy is highlighted by Scofield's own note on Page 1346 of the Bible where he strongly condemns the Catholic Church. The news of the lost Bible was part of a letter whose text is:

30 Sept. '09

My dear Helene:

Your letter of the 27th finds me still at "Crestwood" but just in the miseries of packing to go. It is hard to leave the glory of these autumn forests and streams, but work calls, & even louder is the call of a purse which has grown dismally empty—Scofielditis, you know. I hate to gather up books & papers for so many flittings as I seem doomed to make. When I get rich I am going to have 3 homes—one in a winter apartment on Washington Heights, N. Y. City, one at Crestwood, one at Sorrento, Italy. I shall then have duplicates-triplicates—of everything in the way of belongings which I especially value—works of reference for serious studies; my favorite books, prints &c. I shall live in N. Y., Nov.-February; Sorrente, March-May; Crestwood, June-October. In N. Y. I shall have a large lecture room in the Carnegie Institute, & hold forth to all & sundry who may come for biblical instruction say 3 afternoons & 3 evenings in the week. At Sorrento & Crestwood I shall write books—un peu—but mostly loaf and invite my soul. The first year of that arrangement I shall divide myself & family up so that part of *each of* my three semesters shall be shared by you & Abbie. How bad that all this depends on the cure of my (chronic) Scofielditis!

My dear! Did not you get the Bible I ordered sent you simultaneously with Abbie? I am distressed beyond words. No wonder you marvelled what could be the reason for your exclusion. There was of course *no* reason—how could there be? I will look the matter up teute suite. Of a certainty you shall have a copy. The idea!

Noel is in the Hawley School of Steam & Electric Engineering in Boston—six feet high, frail as a reed, never really well—& we are to spend the winter in Boston, a city that I loathe & abhor past any descriptive words available to a Christian. It will not do to leave that most careless of created beings to his own devices as to changes of clothing, care of diet &c-&c. He is a thoroughly fine fellow, but oh so heedless of the things which alone keep him on his long legs.

I have been entrusted by the University of Oxford with the task of gathering a large company of American Hebrew & Greek scholars for the preparation of a great Commemorative Edition of the English Bible to be issued in 1911—the 300th anniversary of the publication of the A.V. in 1611. Boston is a good place to do such work—but oh the beastly cold & the east wind!

My address there will be, at present, The Canterbury 14 Charlesgate W. Thanks for your news. Have courage, dear. If my ------ itis is ever healed you shall have ease too.

Your loving father
C. I. Scofield[5]

One thing that comes out in the letter is that Scofield must have let down on his "Rapture-watching."[6] Or, was that only for Dispensational hoi-polloi and not for the leaders? The desire to have three homes at some time in the future is more than unusual for a cleric. And, this

at age 66. Scofield writes as though the housing prospectus in John 14: 1 had no appeal. The schedule of home occupancy suggests that more than a little earthly day-dreaming had been mixed in with the preparation of what some have called a"'God-breathed" study.[7]

The desire to live in Sorrento, Italy, is quite amazing for a man who ostensibly had the values usually attributed to Dispensationalists. There is something quite different in the atmosphere of Sorrento (and the Amalfi Coast). This writer, when he was there, felt that it would not have been surprising, as one turned the next street corner, to see a cloven-hoofed satyr sitting on a rock, blowing his pipes. It is just not possible to conceive that Scofield was culturally capable of appreciating or adapting to Sorrento, religious variations aside.

We note another inconsistency between the public and private Scofield. In a message which he gave to The Union Bible Training Class in Dallas in December 1904, he said:

> Go to the great cities, the great pleasure resorts of the world, look along the Italian Riviera and see the idlers of the earth and fill your soul with loathing and contempt for them; they are the inventors of new vices, the degraders of humanity. They are living upon the *too*-much toil of some men.[8]

The geography of the area establishes that Sorrento is separated from the Riviera by the Ligurian and Tyrrhenian Seas, but the Amalfi Coast is noted for exactly the same thing that Scofield in 1904 condemned as occurring along the Riviera. In the letter, he explicitly states that he wants to do what he condemned before the Bible class. Where the idea of Sorrento originated, we cannot be sure, but how it could have come up as he was doing the "God-breathed" study we cannot imagine. Incidentally, Philip Mauro, another Bible teacher and lawyer, had a summer home in Rapallo, Italy.[9]

From chapter 16, we noted that while Papa was never able to do much for Helene's "Scofielditis," a capable American entrepreneur did come to her rescue. Scofield's continuing "Scofielditis" contrasts with the promise of Philippians 4:19: "But my God shall supply all your need according to his riches in glory by Christ Jesus."

His distaste for Boston is remarkable, especially since he had been both economically and ideologically a product of what Boston stood for. We cannot get a real picture of son Noel from the comments of September 1909.

Scofield was back in Dallas for a business meeting of First Church on November 3, 1909.[10] All three ministers of the church submitted their resignations. Scofield (as noted in the letter to Helene) had accepted an invitation from Oxford University Press to serve as editor of a tercentenary edition of the Kings James Bible. This was scheduled for

release in 1911 as a commemoration of the Authorized Version of 1611.[11] The church in Dallas made Scofield pastor emeritus and gave him a salary of $600 per year. Meanwhile, he was getting an increasing number of speaking engagements. This gave him an excellent opportunity to broadcast the idea of a failing, irrelevant church and a decaying world as the hope made available by the sacrifice of Jesus Christ at Calvary.[2]

During 1910, Scofield followed the congregation of First Church in severing his connection with the Congregational denomination on account of its growing liberalism (Sadducean leaven). He requested and was granted membership in the Paris (Texas) presbytery of the Southern Presbyterian Church. Possibly some questioned why he had so delayed his break with apostasy. In an attempt to justify the timing of his move, he said that while he was working on the Reference Bible, he had been out of touch with developments in the Congregational denomination. He told Trumbull:

> And so it happened that, at last, I lifted by face from my work and found that the denomination in whose fellowship I have found great and true men of God, had resolutely moved to positions I could not follow.[13]

Quite frankly, this writer considers the statement to be so much malarkey. The E. E. Gordon work, cited several times, makes it clear that the trend was apparent even before the days when Scofield hunted possum in Wilson County. "Prophecy buffs" have loved to regale conference sessions with stories. including specifics as to time, day, place and person, of apostasy in the church. This is done to give firm proof that the requirements for announcing the unannounced coming of the Lord are being met.[14] Such concerns were always part of conferences such as Niagara and Sea Cliff. The conference pattern has not changed as the century has passed, except for the specific citations and the intensity of the reported apostasy. Thus, we feel that Scofield's statement that he was unaware of apostasy is at best very, very strange for a man whose perception has been cited as being so good.

Cause and effect cannot always be easily placed in proper relationship. This is especially true about a book which came out with the date of 1910 and C. I. Scofield as author. The title was *Addresses on Prophecy;* the publisher, A. C. Gaebelein, 456 Fifth Avenue, New York. It was a collection of lectures or messages on prophecy which Scofield had given over previous years. Whether Gaebelein was trying to capitalize on Scofield, the Bible commentator, or whether Gaebelein was hoping to push the Bible by issuing Scofield's lectures in book form, we cannot tell. In any case, the book is so very, very representative of the thinking and theology of the school which Scofield made legitimate. The Table of Contents lists:

CONTENTS

Influence of Prophetic Truth Upon Character and Conduct 3
God's Purpose in this Age 13
The Church of God 28
The Israel of God I. Past 42
do. II. Future 56
do. III. The Messianic Question 67
The Millennium 104
The Future State ..... 120[15]

The first lecture "'Influence of Prophetic Truth Upon Character and Conduct" is, for Scofield, a most amazing tour-de-force. From page 4, note the following:

> . . . It is therefore a believing understanding of prophetic truth which was an influence upon either character or conduct.
>
> I have mentioned these two words, character and conduct. Perhaps it would be well to make a little explanation here. Character is what we are. Conduct is what we do. A great many people seem to think that reputation and character are identical things. This is not so. Reputation is what is said about us. Character is what we are. I believe that, in the long run, character and reputation and conduct will all harmonize. For a time our reputation may be better or may be worse than we deserve. Very severe things may be said about us. If we are right with God though, we need not mind that. We need not greatly concern ourselves about it, for in due time we shall be vindicated. On the other hand, we may be believed to be better than we are. Now, conduct in the long run, springs from character. A bad man does not habitually do good actions, nor a good man habitually do evil actions. We all know these things; they are very familiar to us.[16]

The preceding pages suggest that there was a substantial variation between the way in which Scofield lived and the ideas which he touted in this essay.

His comments on character formation are interesting, for when considered in the light of his life, they carry a negative impact for the theology or the system he expounded. The principles are:

> First, association. Our intimacies, our associations, perhaps more powerfully than any other influence, determine, in the long run, what we are. . . .
>
> A second formative influence, which we all recognize and will admit, is knowledge. . . .
>
> Third, it is expectation which forms us—that which we look forward to; a large element of hope or of fear, whichever it may be. . . .[17]

The third is the most important of our study. The character deficiencies which we have noted and those which appear as we go on, even in this chapter, must raise a question as to the value of The Imminent Return as a character-building idea.

The second lecture was picked up word for word from a pamphlet which published the message when it was first delivered in Dallas on

October 15, 1892. Constancy and stability are important. But in areas as controversial as prophetic interpretation, as shifting and unsure as typical eschatology was in those days, we must be amazed at the lack of development in 17 years. Our analysis of the message, in chapter 21 shows that Scofield was committed to failure for the church and suffering for the world, suffering which he intended to avoid sharing.

In the third message, we get a view of what he thought about the church, what this writer has noted as the "Failing Church Syndrome"—that the church is not to succeed in *any* mission given it by the Lord. He limits his exposition by clinging to a dichotomy of idea which is peculiar to Dispensationalism:

> It is not so much wealth, luxury, power, pomp, and pride that have served to deflect the church from her appointed course, as the notion, founded upon Israelitish promises, tha the church is of the world, and that therefore, her mission is to improve this world. Promises which were given to Israel alone are quoted as justifying what we see all about us. The church, therefore, has failed to follow her appointed pathway of separation, holiness, heavenliness and testimony to an absent but coming Christ; she has turned aside from that purpose to the work of civilizing the world, building magnificent temples, and acquiring earthly power and wealth, and in this way, has ceased to follow in the footsteps of Him who had not where to lay His head. Did you ever put side by side the promises given to the church, and to Israel, and see how absolutely in contrast they are? It is impossible to mingle them.

Then he brings in a fate of the church in which Dr. Scofield does not expect to share:

> The promise to the church is a promise of persecution, if faithful in this world, but a promise of a great inheritance and reward thereafter. In the meantime, she is to be a pilgrim body, passing through this scene, but not abiding here.[18]

Then he places all earthly blessing in the future, a future from which the Church of Christ is excluded:

> I believe that that day is drawing very near. Oh that in the last remnant of time, before we hear the shout of our descending Lord and rise to meet him in the air, we might come back with holiness of heart to the simplicity of our mission, the evangelization of the world! Dear friends, let us leave the government of the world till the King comes; let us leave the civilizing of the world to be the incidental effect of the presence there of the gospel of Christ, and let us give our time, our strength, our money, our days to the mission distinctively committed to the church, namely: to make Christ known "to every creature."[19]

We have commented elsewhere on the inability to understand his idea of evangelization without conversion. The fact that we can write this message more than 70 years after it was printed makes the idea "drawing very near" seem strained. We suggest that Scofield's sense of time was

not that which the Lord has really provided for the edification of the saints. Again, note that he would bar the church from social impact, from any steps toward relief of suffering, from any steps toward decency.

The lecture, "The Millennium," gives Scofield a chance to trot out a warhorse which his prophetic cult likes to use against those who have a different eschatology:

> . . . Scripture, as we have abundantly seen in the previous articles, never speaks of a time *in this age* when the whole world would be a converted world. . . .[20]

Now the idea of a *totally* converted world smacks of universalism. And it has never been held by any reputable conservative nonpremillennialist. The statement is a bit of semantic trickery. (The growing Biblical Postmillennial movement calls not for a totally converted world, but for a Christian dominated world especially with totally Christian direction of the culture. This is a far different idea, but it is supported by Scriptures, especially I John 5:4 and Rev. 2:26.) We would note that Scofield by his straw-man-warhorse forced his followers into a position which makes a mockery of The Great Commission *(Matt. 28:19)*.[21] And while Scofield claims that the position he derides is never spoken of by the Lord, the Lord did make statements which refute the claim of the Dispensationalists that the Church Age is to be a failure. Note that the Lord specifically told His followers to pray that the Lord's Will was to be done on Earth as it is in Heaven. The Lord's Will could hardly be done in the world which the Dispensationalists from Scofield to Hal Lindsay envisage as the future. This may be why some followers of Scofield refuse to pray as the Lord commanded.

Scofield ends the message we are considering with a completely racist idea that God, even after Calvary, deals with men differently according to their racial make-up (the idea is known as the Postponed Kingdom Theory). This idea had permeated the Bible Institute movement until they seem shackled to one concept at the expense of the church as a whole. Socfield's book was reprinted several times and remarkably has been accepted without it seemingly obvious faults being noted.

Another opportunity for publication came to Scofield in this period. Rev. Amzi E. Dixon, D.D., had been appointed editor of a project called *The Fundamentals*. Lyman Stewart, founder of the Union Oil Company of California, was appalled at the tide of modernism and infidelity sweeping the world. To stem it, he proposed issuing a series of essays on the various points of faith to show what the fundamental elements of Christian belief were. Lyman was assisted financially in the project by his brother, Milton. The whole scheme was permeated with the Dispensational view, which the Stewarts, lacking deep background, took to be traditional Christianity.

Scofield's contribution was an essay entitled "The Grace of God." It is entirely consistent with the Dispensational theological position. Quite properly it could be entitled "A Short Commentary on Galatians, Dispensationally interpreted." The study is largely an exposition of Scofield's bias against the Law and an expression of his antinomian understanding of grace. He says:

> . . . It is, however, of the most vital moment to observe that Scripture never, in any dispensation, mingles these two principles. Law always has a place and work distinct and wholly diverse from that of grace. Law is God prohibiting, and requiring (Ex. 20:1, 17); grace is God beseeching, and bestowing (2 Cor. 5:18,21). Law is a ministery of condemnation (Rom 3:19); grace, of forgiveness (Eph. 1:7). Law curses (Gal. 3: 10); grace redeems from that curse (Gal. 3:1). Law kills (Rom. 7:9,11); grace makes alive (John 10:10). Law shuts every mouth before God; grace opens every mouth to praise Him. Law puts a great and guilty distance between man and God (Ex. 20:18,19); grace makes guilty man nigh to God (Eph. 2:13). Law says 'An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth." (Ex. 21:24); grace says "Resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on they right cheek, turn to him the other also" (Matt. 5:39). Law says, "Hate thine enemy" grace, "Love your enemies, bless them that despitefully use you." Law says, do and live (Luke 10:26,28); grace, believe and live (John 5:24). Law never had a missionary; grace is to be preached to every creature. Law utterly condemns the best man (Phil. 3:4,9); grace freely justifies the worst (Luke 23:24); Rom. 5:5; I Tim. 1:15; I Cor. 6:9,11). Law is a system of probation; grace, of favor. Law stones an adulteress (Deut 22:21); grace says, "Neither do I condemn thee" (John 8: 1,11). Under law the sheep dies for the shepherd; under grace the shepherd dies for the sheep (John 10.11)[22]

Anyone with even a modicum of exposure to Reformed theology can go over the quotation with a red pencil and line out statement after statement.

A page or so later, Scofield pronounces an idea which has, in more recent times, brought forth the anathema of A. W. Tozer. Scofield wrote:

> Grace, on the contrary, is not looking for good men whom it may approve, for it is not grace, but mere justice, to approve goodness, but it is looking for condemned, guilty, speechless and helpless men whom it may save through faith, sanctify and glorify.[23]

Tozer's anathema stems from the fact that this idea plants in the seeker a motivation to become bad, dip deep into fleshly sins or even crimes, in order to start on the path to redemption. such a view is utterly unbiblical, but is given encouragement from such statements as that of "Dr." Cyrus.

In concluding this glimpse into the ideas of a man who proudly misrepresented his war decoration, we quote another passage which shows his twisting of the Law which, in turn, impugnes the idea of morality in the life of the individual believer:

> Protestant theology, alas, is for the most part, thoroughly Galatianized, in that neither law nor grace are given their distinct and separated places, as in the counsels of God, but are mingled together in one incoherent system. The law is no longer, as in the Divine intent, a ministration of death (2 Cor. 3:7), of cursing (Gal. 3:10), of conviction (Rom. 3:19), because we are taught that we must try to keep it, and that by Divine help we may.[24]

Its obsession with the "Failing Church Syndrome" may not have been the only reason that the impact of *The Fundamentalist* was less than overwhelming.[25]

Scofield spent sometime during the summer of 1910 at Crestwood. The last reference to Crestwood was the fire of 1907. Within the next year or so, a substantial structure replaced the impermanence of tents. On his 70th birthday, Scofield had a picture taken with the house in the background. He sent a print to his sister's family. On the back he wrote:

> 70th Birthday, August 19, 1913. At my home "Crestwood", Ashuelot, N. H. Grateful to God for His grace in salvation and some measure of usefulness.[26]

During this period Scofield was working with and for Oxford University Press on the edition of the Bible which was to mark the tercentennary of the King James Version. At the time of Scofield's death, *Moody Bible Institute Monthly* published a photograph taken in 1910 or 1911 showing Scofield and his associates at work. The photograph was taken in the Alcove of the Library at Princeton.[27] The committee included: Prof. Robert Dick Wilson of Princeton Seminary, Raven of New Brunswick, Creelam of Auburn, Robinson of McCormick Seminary (Chicago), Dr. Joseph Kyle of Xenia, Thomas J. Packard of Maryland, Hayes of Garrett Bible Institute (Evanston, Illinois), Crawford of Virginia Theological Seminary, O'Meara of Wycliffe College (Toronto), James M. Gray of Moody Bible Institute (Chicago), and C. I. Scofield.

According to William M. Runyan, Gray was a member of the Old Testament Committee, a section of the main group. Few references to this 1911 Bible have been noted. In his sketch "Dr. Gray at Moody Bible Institute," Runyan gave this description of the 1911 work:

> This Bible is not another version, but a reexamination of the text of the King James' with a view of correcting, in the light of the best modern research, such passages as are recognized by all scholars as in any measure misleading or needlessly obscure.[28]

Scofield was the only one of the group who lacked academic training in the areas of the committee's charge. There was nothing in his chequered career which qualified him for the task at hand, except his gift of gab, and the support of unidentified sponsors. It would be interesting

to know what the actual reaction of a true scholar like Robert Dick Wilson was to Scofield. (The Moody caption misprinted his name as Richard Dick. The error was apparently unnoticed for over half a century.)[29] Did Wilson's perception find any chink in the cover-up which Scofield had been erecting with considerable success since 1879?

The 1911 Bible came out as scheduled. Oxford in its trade catalog said:

> A system of chain references specially prepared by Dr. C. I. Scofield, D.D., Editor of the Scofield Reference Bible tracing through the whole Bible the greater themes of Divine revelation from their first clear emergence to the final and complete form in the New Testament.[30]

The tercentennary edition of the Bible appears to have had no great impact and was soon forgotten. It was not mentioned in the booklet issued by the Press for its 500th anniversary.[31]

Late in 1911 or early in 1912, Scofield received a request from Marquis Publishing Company, Chicago. They wanted information about his life from entry in *Who's Who in America, Vol. 7.* Relatively few Fundamental clergymen were considered for this recognition and we wonder whether Cyrus Scofield would have been asked for data if his Bible had not been published by Oxford University Press. The form sent by Marquis was duly filled in as Cyrus considered proper and returned. Marquis ordinarily accepts the material submitted, assuming (we think rightly so) that if a subject is of sufficient interest to merit entry, the data submitted should be substantially correct. It would be naive to expect Marquis to act as a conscience to a society whose standards are flexible. Scofield and the Coster-Musica affair of the late 1930's were two cases where Marquis' technique was inadequate.

The entry, on page 1850 of the 1912 work is:

> SCOFIELD, Cyrus Ingerson, clergyman; b. Lenawee Co., Mich., Aug. 19, 1843, and reared in Wilson Co., Tenn; S. Elias and Abl. (Goodrich) S: pvtly fitted for coll., but univ. studies interrupted by breaking out of Civil War; m. Hettie van Wart, of Ypsilanti, Mich., July 14, 1884. Pvt. Co. H. 7th Tenn. Inf. May 1861 to close of Civil War; served in Army of Northern Va. under Gen. Lee, and awarded Cross of Honor for valor at battle of Antietam; admitted to Kan. bar, 1869, mem. Kan. Ho. of Rep. from Atchison and Nemaha cos., 1870-1; apptd U. S. atty. for Kan. by President Grant, 1873. Converted to Christian religion at St. Louis, 1879, ordained Congregational ministry, 1883, pastor First Ch., Dallas, Tex., 1882-1895, Moody Ch. Northfield, Mass. 1895-1902 and First Ch., Dallas, 1905-7. Has lectured extensively on bible subjects in Europe and America. Mem. S. A. R. Colonial Founders, Soc. Colonial Wars, *Club* Lotos, *Author* Rightly Dividing the Word of Truth, 1885, Addresses on Prophecy 1909, The Doctrine of The Holy Spirit, 1906, Lectures on Galatians, 1907, *Editor,* Scofield Reference Bible, 1910, Bible of 1911, 1911. Head of Scofield Corr. Bible Sch. *Home,* "Crestwood", Ashuelot, N. H., and Lotos Club, New York. *Office* 156 5th Av., New York.[32]

In this 1912 entry, we note the following:

A. Mis-statements or factual inaccuracies:

	STATEMENT	
1.	Reared in Wilson Co., Tenn.	No contact with Tenn. before 1858
2.	University studies interrupted by War	No evidence
3.	Service in Confederate Army until end of War	Discharged in 1862
4.	Service under General Lee	Only as GI's in WWII were under Eisenhower
5.	Decorated for valor at Antietam	Utterly false—see Chap. 5
6.	Wedding day, July 14, 1884	Correct dates: Sept. 21, 1866 March 11, 1884 Certificates available

B. Omission of items pertinent but not known in Christian community:
   1. Leontine
   2. Abigail, Marie Helene and Guy Sylvestere
   3. The divorce of 1882-1883

C. Items omitted from *Who's Who* but circulated in areas where he ministered or among his followers:
   1. Story of birth in Tennessee
   2. Existence of Son, Noel
   3. The"law practice" in St. Louis

   (The Presidency of the Northfield Schools may be a story invented later.)

The items listed under A all sound quite reasonable and would not be checked on unless a devoted history "buff" was working on a serious biographic study of the subject. Thus the chance of being tripped up could have seemed so unlikely that fact was stretched beyond limits.

The item identified as C 3 above may be more significant in evaluating Dispensationalism and its developers than any exposition of any part of Scripture. It may serve better than the various carefully thought out commentaries on Dispensational distinctives which have been appearing in the last generation.

Some readers by this point may be feeling that we have made too much of the discrepancies in the stories told about Scofield's life. After all, could they not have originated through carelessness or misunderstanding? The likelihood of that is virtually impossible with regards the *Who's Who* entry. The story of the law practice in St. Louis, widely circulated in Fundamental circles, has no support in official records. But it has circulated with impunity among Dispensationalists and Evangelicals. Whoever prepared the data for Marquis or whoever advised Scofield on what to submit knew that the story of the St. Louis law practice could not safely be published outside the Dispensational com-

munity. Such selectivity is not a matter of carelessness, but rather of careful calculation in deception and how much one may "get away with." It further indicates a contempt for the intelligence of followers. They could be expected not to check up on any stories, no matter how reasonable or outlandish. If a system whose interpretation can be faulted uses calculated falsehood in describing its "patriarch," can the system (Dispensationalism) have any credibility?

Scofield made a trip to the British Isles early in 1912. At the time of the sinking of the S. S. *Titanic* (April 14, 1912), he was in Belfast, Ulster. After his return to the United States, he related some rather embroidered stories about his activities in Belfast. He reported that on the Sunday following the disaster, the city was in a state of tension and turmoil (he should have seen it in the 1970's and 1980's). Scofield's report was that the Lord Mayor of Belfast (that official in 1912 was Robert J. McMordie, a Presbyterian) asked him (Scofield) to address the populace. Scofield related that he delivered a message entitled "The Unsinkable Ship." He was also to declare that through the efforts of one C. I. Scofield, the entire city was calmed.[33]

Feeling that some details of the story were in need of verification, this writer checked the files of Belfast newspaper held by the British Library in London. The issues of April 1912 noted the horror felt but indicated no tension or turmoil and, more significant, made no reference to an American named Scofield.

Thanks to the Rev. Adam Loughridge of the Raformed Presbyterian Church of Ireland, it was possible to have access to files of *The Northern Whig*, a now defunct paper, whose issues were not in the British Library collection. That paper, in its day, gave very good coverage to religious events. On page 9, issue of April 22, 1912, it is noted:

> A service in the Y.M.C.A. Hall, (Wellington Place) was very largely attended, the chief speaker being Rev. Dr. Schofield, well known American Clergyman. An offering was taken for relief funds.[34]

In a much fuller report on another page it was noted, as reported to the writer by Prof. Loughridge:

> . . . Sir James Henderson presided; the prayer was offered by Rev. J. M. Alley of the Methodist Church; the Scriptures were read by the Rev. Robert Duff, Presbyterian; the address was given by Dr. Scofield. There follows the usual newspaper-type summary of the address, which seems to have been based on the text, "God is Love." At the close, the hymn "Nearer My God to Thee" was sung and the benediction pronounced by the Ref. F. E. Marsh.

Continuing, Prof. Loughridge says:

> In the summary of the address I could find no reference to his suggested theme, "The Unsinkable Ship," and certainly his claim to have been

> instrumental in calming the city is typical Scofield bombast, as this meeting was only one of many held in the city that day. The impression I gained from reading other reports of the tragedy in The *Northern Whig,* is that the city was very calm and sober and filled with a deep sense of awe by the event.[35]

Note that Rev. Loughridge was unable to find any reference of contact between Lord Mayor McMordie and the incredible Cyrus Scofield. Embellished stories or not, the European trip of 1912 appears to have been of shorter duration than previous trips when he claimed to be researching or writing.[36]

Sometime in this period, the Scofields moved their residence to "Greyshingles" at the corner of Main Street and Virginia Ave., Douglaston, in the eastern extremity of the Borough of Queens, New York City. Douglaston was and remained for years an exclusive enclave. It had its own atmosphere, a bit cut off from all that was Gotham. The available material of these years does not provide an explanation of how the Scofields lived. The letter quoted at the beginning of this chapter suggests that financial insecurity was regular enough to be entitled "Scofielditis." The only guaranteed income was $600 per year from First Church.[37] The cost of keeping Noel in Hawley would have taken all that and possibly more. There would be little or nothing for European junkets—or for purchasing a house in a "better" neighborhood. How was it done?

On his 70th birthday, August 19, 1913, addressing a friend, Scofield quoted the 71st Psalm, verse 18, applying it to himself:

> Hitherto have I declared thy wondrous works. Now also when I am old, and gray-headed, 0 God, forsake me not, until I have showed Thy strength unto this generation and Thy power to every one that is to come.[38]

CHAPTER 31 NOTES

1. BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 83.
2. Pastor's Report to First Congregational Church, 1908.
3. *Ibid.*
4. *Ibid.*
5. Original lent to the writer by Mr. John H. Mize, Atchison, Kan.
6. In a letter of January 19, 1903, to A. P. Fitt (see chapter 24), Scofield had said: "I expect to keep my summer home at (or near) E. Northfield." Since at that time Crestwood was largely unimproved property the statement must have been based on a lot of earthly planning or day-dreaming.
7. Reference to a statement in Dr. James M. Gray's puff of Scofield's work.
8. "The Seven Covenants," address by C. I. Scofield before The Union Bible Training Class, Dallas, Texas, Dec. 5, 1904, p. 10.
9. See *Champion of The Kingdom,* by Gordon P. Gardinar, Bread of Life, Brooklyn, N. Y., 1961, p. 34.
10. Record Book, Minutes of First Church, Nov. 3, 1909.
11. *Ibid.*
12. Salary figure quote by BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 85.
13. Trumbull, *op. cit.,* p. 119.

14. Citations ad nauseam could be given. The result would only use up space.
15. Facing page 3. The work was reprinted in 1914 by Charles C. Cook, N. Y., and more recently by The Gospel Hour, Greenville, S. C. The last edition refers to a total issue of 35,000 copies.
16. Scofield, *op. cit.*, p. 4.
17. *Ibid.*, p. 5.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 38.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 41.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 104.
21. The "Great Commission" calls for the baptizing of all nations. This can occur only after people believe, so it must mean widespread, general conversion. The Scofield-induced doctrine of a remnant waiting to be "Raptured" is completely at variance with the direct word of The Lord. The essentially negative view of Scofield's beliefs is only now being noted.
22. Chapter VII, "The Grace of *God*" by Rev. C. I. Scofield, D.D. in *The Fundamentals*, p. 100.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 102.
24. *Ibid.*, p. 104.
25. While *The Fundamentals* continues in print and is circulated, the effect has been negligible. The only evaluation of its impact noted is The *Roots of Fundamentalism, British and American Millenarianism,* 1800-1930 by Ernest Sandeen, pp. 188-207. Sandeen is reasonably objective about the positions of the papers but notes that the format discouraged all but the most studious. This writer feels that the definite Dispensational Premillennial bias doomed the whole effort.
26. Original photograph property of Mr. Richard Kammerer, Gettysburg, Pa. Lent to the writer for this work.
27. *Moody Bible Institute Monthly,* Sept. 1921, p. 552.
28. Wm. M. Runyan, *Dr. James M. Gray* at Moody Bible Institute, Oxford University Press, New York, 1935, p. 99.
29. The Scofield Memorial article of September 1921.
30. *Trade Catalog,* Oxford University Press, 1911.
31. *A Little Quincentennary History, 1478-1978*, Oxford University Press, 1978.
32. *Who's Who in America,* Vol. 7, 1912, 1913, Marquis Publishing Co., Chicago, 1912, p. 1856.
33. *The Doctrine of The Last Things as Found in The Gospels,* p. 115, in *The Kingdom and Coming of Christ,* BICA, Chicago, 1914. Also in *The Sunday School Times,* LXIII, August 13, 1921, and *The Dallas Morning News,* November 28, 1921, p. 7.
34. As quoted to the writer by Ref. Adam Loughridge.
35. Letter to the writer from Rev. Adam Loughridge. Quoted by permission.
36. More on the *Titanic* incident in the next chapter.
37. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 85.
38. Scofield must have related the incident, or shown the letter to James M. Gray. Gray referred to it in his testimonial in 1916 and published it in the 1921 tribute, *Moody Monthly,* p. 552, where we located it.

CHAPTER 32

Scofield Postpones the Kingdom—and Sinks the *Titanic*

". . . Now is come salvation, and strength and the kingdom of our God, and the power of his Christ . . ."

Rev. 12:10

In 1914. Scofield "made it." He appeared on the platform of a major prophetic conference. The idea of a premillennial return of the Lord had been carefully merchandised in North America by a series of "prophetic conferences" held in major cities.

The first, in New York, October 1878, was about a year before Scofield was converted. At the time of the second, in Chicago, November 1886, Scofield was a tyro pastor with little more than a local reputation. The third, held in Allegheny, Pennsylvania, in December 1895 occurred when Scofield was busy moving from Dallas to Northfield. The fourth, in Boston in 1901, either was not ready for Scofield, or Scofield was not ready for it.[1]

By the time the fifth conference was in the planning stage, Scofield's reputation, as editor of *The Scofield Reference Bible*, made a place for him on the program a certainty. He was one of the signers of the call to the conference which went out Dec. 1, 1913. Note the tone and purpose of the affair as seen in this excerpt from the call:

> To Christian Believers in the United States and Canada,
>
> Dear Brethren:
>
> It is twelve years since the International Prophetic Conference was held in the city of Boston, and many brethren feel that the times demand testimony to the doctrine of the premillennial coming of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. We therefore cordially and urgently invite you to meet with us and others for this holy purpose, at the Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, Ill., from Tuesday to Friday, February 24th to 27th, 1914.
>
> It is believed that the signers of this invitation are a guarantee that the Conference will not offer an opportunity for modern prophets to ventilate their speculations, to fix dates, or to mark out a detailed program of the future; but that, to incorporate the language of and earlier conference, the occasion will be used for students of prophecy to give prominence to neglected truths; to employ the true principles of Scripture interpretation; to warn against present-day apostasy; to awaken slumbering Christians; to present the most majestic of all motives for worldwide evangelism; to call attention to the doctrine of "last things" as a bulwark

against the skepticism of modern theology; and to bring into closer fellowship all those who 'love His appearing.'[2]

The "call" was signed by:

JOHN TIMOTHY STONE,
Pastor, Fourth Presbyterian Church, Chicago (Moderator of the Presbyterian Church U.S.A.)
ROBERT McWATTY RUSSELL,
President, Westminster College, (Moderator of the United Presbyterian Church)
WILLIAM G. MOOREHEAD,
President, Xenia Theological Seminary
E. Y. MULLINS,
President, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
T. R. O'MEARA,
Principal, Wycliffe College, Toronto
W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS,
Professor, Wycliffe College, Toronto
C. I. SCOFIELD,
Editor, *The Scofield Reference Bible.*
H. B. HARTZLER,
Editor, The *Evangelical*
A. C. GAEBELEIN,
Editor, *Our Hope*
R. A. TORREY,
Dean, The Bible Institute, Los Angeles
W. B. RILEY,
Pastor, First Baptist Church, Minneapolis,
President, Northwestern Bible School
JAMES M. GRAY,
Dean, The Moody Bible Institute, Chicago.

The name of Rev. John Timothy Stone at the head of the list of conveners provided a note of "'class." Chicago's Fourth Presbyterian Church has always had an atmosphere missing from Dispensational churches, no matter how large. Even though he led the list of conveners, Stone was unable to be present at the sessions.

The conference did differ from its predecessors. Richard Ellsworth Day was to say of it: "It is fair to say that prophecy thereupon got out of its rags and entered good society."[3]

Undoubtedly the burden of planning had fallen on "The Well-groomed Little Man in the Grey Fedora," Dr. James M. Gray.[4] In speaking of the 1914 Conference, Dr. Wilbur M. Smith was later to say:

> You could not gather together, if you combed the world and promised ten thousand dollars to each of them, such a group of prophetic authorities as Dr. Gray gathered for the Conference.[5]

One of the "authorities" is the subject of this work, C. I. Scofield.[6] Charles G. Trumbull, speaking of Scofield's part noted: ". . . that message was laughed at by the general public and newspaper reporters at the

time."[7] The secular press, Hal Lindsay to the contrary, has not moved all that far from its 1914 position, even in the face of daily crises throughout the world.

Scofield delivered three messages on successive mornings. The topics were: "The Doctrine of The Last Things as Found in The Prophets," "The Doctrine of the Last Things as Found in The Gospels," "The Doctrine of The Last Things as Found in The Epistles and Revelation."

In the first message, Scofield tried to define the role of the prophet, but he did it in such a way that he justified the particular system which he espoused:

> You will find that the prophet saw two kinds of things: he saw his own age, the times in which he lived, from the divine point of view, and that is a very different thing from seeing it from the human point of view. That was the radical difference between the true prophets and the false prophets. The latter judged everything from the human standard. The true prophet was the analyst and the exponent of his own time. But in whatever Jehovah may have had controversy with his ancient people, the true prophet was on God's side, and therefore he was the unpopular man.[8]

Scofield uses a term which is a "war-horse" of his system, "His ancient people" to describe the people of the Two Kingdoms. Note that the obedient Israelites—and only the obedient ones—were the people identified with the purpose of God. But their chosen role was always conditional on obedience. The thought in the term "ancient people" carries implications which are incorrect, for God used the method of a special people only until Calvary and A.D. 70.

Continuing, Scofield says:

> The real prophet of God was an unpopular man because he saw, below the superficial prosperity of the time, that which a holy God could not approve. The man of God "saw" because he *was* a man of God, and, seeing, he spoke, and so we have the prophetic ministry.[9]

True, but the popularity of the prophetic teachers of the 20th century belies either the principle Scofield enunciated or the position of the teachers. Again typing the prophetic role to his system, Scofield says:

> Then came a promise of encouragement. After seventy years, a remnant should return (Jer. 25:11,12). It was necessary that Messiah should be born in that land; it was necessary that the Mosaic law should be in full operation in that land, when the Messiah should come.[9]

But that last statement is obviously false. This can be proven from passage after passage in the Gospels. The Mosaic law was really not in operation in the Roman provinces of Judah and Galilee around 30 A.D. The incident at the opening of John 8, of the woman and the leaders, is typical.

The nature of the prophecy being presented those February days is shown by this quotation:

THE KINGDOM NOT THE CHURCH

> The first thing we need to remember, and always to remember, when we are studying the prophetic picture of the Kingdom is that it is not in any sense whatever a picture of the Church. We are told distinctly by the apostle Paul that the Old Testameant prophet did not see the Church (Eph. 3:1-10). The Old Testament prophet saw a world-wide salvation; saw not only Israel as the object and beneficiary of that salvation, but also the Gentiles; and you know how copiously the apostle Paul, in the ninth, tenth and eleventh chapters of Romans, quotes from the Old Testament prophetic writings, to show that the Gentile was always in God's thought in connection with the saving work of the Messiah.[10]

The statement "the Old Testament prophet did not see the Church" is reached only by using the Darby-Scofield system of interpretation. In the rest of the paragraph, Scofield tries to make a distinction essential to Dispensationalism, but as the paragraph progresses it seems that his citations argue both sides of the question. He fails to prove that there is a distinction between kingdom and church.

Scofield did look to a better day, but one which did not include the church:

> Next the prophet sees the spiritual nature of that Kingdom. The very power by which the King will establish His Kingdom is the resistless power of the Spirit of God.[11]

In contrasting the present and future, he made a personal reference, the full significance of which was lost on that 1914 audience:

> . . . And yet how clumsy are our attempts at justice, after all! I used to practice law, and so had a first-hand opportunity of seeing how often justice miscarries.[11]

He was very familiar with miscarriage of justice, especially in the cases of Jephtha Simpson, James McLean and Frank Vollmer (unless, as *The Atchison Patriot* reporter claimed, Emeline paid up.)[12] Personal references should be carefully made.

As he continued, Scofield made reference to the Lord's Prayer, a part of Scripture which many of his followers consign almost to perdition:

> Surely there is no opportunity for evasion there. A King shall reign, prosper, and execute judgment and justice in the earth. What is the Lord's prayer? "Thy Kingdom come." What is that Kingdom? "Thy will be done in earth, as it is done in heaven." That will be when a King reigns in righteousness, and prosperity.[13]

Now any common sense view of that prayer and the way in which the Lord presented it, places it in the Church Age. But Scofield is so anxious to have everything held until Gentiles are out of the way, that the full

blessing of the prayer is lost on many church goers. He clung to that idea as he closed the message:

> The ultimate vision of the prophet is that Kingdom of righteousness and peace on this earth, with regathered Israel for its center, and the nations gathered in, to its blessing; and it is always in connection with the setting up of the Kingdom that we get that great expression:
>
> "Then shall the earth be filled with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."
>
> We always get that in connection with the Kingdom. I have done. May God add His blessing, for Jesus' sake![14]

The message concluded before lunch.

The next day, Scofield started his second message by citing the Old Testament prophecies of the kingly role of the Messiah. Then John the Baptist's proclamation "The Kingdom is at Hand!" is noted. Scofield follows the party-line by having the King rejected and the King declaring judgment.

At this point in the message, just about two heartbeats before he firmly sets out what is now called the "Postponed Kingdom" theory, he introduces, supposedly for illustration, a personal experience. Unfortunately, the experience was presented in a way which is substantially false. The implications of falsehood just a couple of heartbeats before propounding a major religious theory are frightening.

The story he introduced was the *Titanic* story, his version of his visit to Belfast, Northern Ireland, 22 months before:

> It fell to my lot to be in Belfast, where the *Titanic* was built, the Sunday after the great ship went down. A great memorial meeting was held in Wellington Hall. They asked me to give the message at that meeting. All Belfast was smitten with sorrow. I have never seen a whole city in such grief. That ship was built there, and a considerable number of the men who were aboard her in various capacities, who went down with the ship, lived in Belfast. Every order of people was there, from the bishops and the nobility up to the laboring class. They packed that great hall.
>
> I tried to preach the gospel from that awful incident, the loss of the *Titanic*. I told them that we were all on a doomed ship; but that God in His mercy had brought a life boat alongside that would hold us all. And the ship upon which humanity is crossing the sea of time is doomed.[15]

No one in the assembly thought to check on the story. We did and, as stated in chapter 31 found the relation to be quite at variance with published reports at the time.

To refresh our memories, note that the newspaper, *Nothern Whig,* issue of April 22, 1912, on page 9 reported meetings in Belfast, memorials for the lost *Titanic* and its company, but no general meeting as Scofield implied. Referring to the meeting addressed by Scofield, we repeat:

> A service in the Y.M.C.A. Hall (Wellington Place) was very largely attended, the chief speaker being Rev. Dr. C. I. Scofield, well-known American Clergymen. An offering was taken for relief funds.[16]

The article summarized Scofield's address, apparently based on the theme "God is Love" and makes no mention of the subject "The Unsinkable Ship" which Scofield claimed was the subject of his message. The newspaper also reported that in contrast to Scofield's claim, the city was very calm and sobered and filled with awe by the tragic event. The report makes it quite clear that the meeting addressed by Scofield was but one of many held that day. His story was quite embroidered and was to receive further embellishment in the Fundamentalist community in the next few years.[17]

But why embroider the simple story of a speaking engagement in a distant city nearly two years previously? Why force the story into the message without its being really relevant?

Another Bible teacher was really involved in the *Titanic* affair. Very early in the morning of Monday, April 15, 1912, the wireless operator of the Cunarder, *S. S. Carpathia* received a message from the *Titanic:* "Come at once, we have struck a berg, It's a C.O.D., old man. Position 41'58" N. 50'14" W. M.G.Y." This was followed by a second message: "S.0.S. M.G.Y."

When the wireless operator on the *Carpathia* replied, "Coming Hard," Bible teacher Philip Mauro and his daughter, Margaret, were asleep in their cabin on the ship. In a letter to daughter, Isabel, Mauro described the scene at daybreak when the *Carpathia* reached the spot where the *Titanic* sank.

> The scene that greeted our eyes when we went on deck yesterday (Monday) morning is indescribable.
>
> We were lying a few thousand yards from a perfect continent of ice, which stretched as far as the eye could reach, with here and there huge ice peaks sticking up into the air. And all around us in the sea were detached icebergs glistening in the sun. It was a perfect polar scene, and although it was only yesterday, and although we remained for hours skirting along the icefield looking for boats and bodies, it seems already like a dream—so unreal and strange does it appear. Surely the hand of God is most manifestly appearing in the affairs of men.
>
> You can imagine the depression and discomfort pervading this boat, with such a cargo of concentrated abjectness and misery added to the rather full passenger list that we had at the start.

Mr. Mauro continued in his letter to Isabel:

> There are more *Titanic* passengers than *Carpathians,* and, of course, there are no accommodations for them in the ordinary sense.[18]
>
> Margaret has given away most of her things (underwear, ete.). There has been (*no* great demand for masculine apparel—but I quickly parted with some stockings, pajamas, and handkerchiefs, besides the

> nice, felt slippers my dear Charlie gave me. the dozen toothbrushes I had were most acceptable. Of course, the people had absolutely nothing but what was on their persons—*not* even hand togs. They were told up to the last few moments that there was no danger of the ship's going down.[19]

But more than physical help was offered. Note a typical incident from the letter.:

> Wednesday. The opportunities are opening out. A splendid one was offered this morning before breakfast. A young man, Albert A. Dick, was saved with his wife (married less than a year ago). The Lord put him in my way. He has made money (three quarters of a million, he told me) and is about quitting business, meaning to devote the rest of his life to "doing good." Said he was not a Christian, but had been reading the Bible trying to find out if there were a God. Was quite ready to listen, and I gave him the truth for some hours. He was in a state similar to that of the Ethiopian treasurer. I am sure the Lord sent me to him and that He gave me the word for him.
>
> * * *
>
> Thursday. We are expecting to reach New York this evening. The opportunities that have opened for ministry have been simply wonderful. Most of them came to Margarent. Such a day as she had yesterday: Hope she may be able to write you some of the marvelous doings of the Lord. Now I want you to send a copy of the *World and Its God* to A. L. Solomon, 345 Broadway, New York. . . . He is a Jew, but his heart is quite tender just now.[20]

Mauro related the *Titanic* experience in *God's Pilgrims,* a study of Hebrews which came out in 1913.

The prophetic conference of February 1914 was the largest public appearance made by Scofield after his Belfast visit of 1912—and after Mauro's book came out in 1913. Scofield's *Titanic* story, even if it had been correct, added nothing to his exposition of the Postponed Kingdom" idea. It could have been inserted as a reaction to Philip Mauro. The possibility is intriguing.[21]

With the *Titanic* sunk, Scofield proceeded in his message to "postpone" the Kingdom (blithely disregarding the possibility that Jesus had not postponed anything):

> Then what? The King has come. The King has announced that His Kingdom is at hand. He has shown His power to establish the Kingdom, and to bring in Kingdom blessings, but Israel will not have her King.
>
> He wept over Jerusalem, and that very weeping, and what He said to Jerusalem is prophetic (Matt. 23:39) for which His rejection as King He begins His predictive testimony concerning this age in which we live. And for this age He has a new message, and His message is not now "the kingdom of heaven is at hand."[22]

The idea had been plainly set out by Scofield in his great opus (The Reference Bible). Footnote 1, page 1011 of The Scofield Bible says:

> The Kingdom announced as "at hand" by John the Baptist, by the King Himself and by the Twelve and attested to by mighty works has been *morally* rejected.[23]

But Scofield has not produced any reference which enable one to pinpoint the exact place in Scripture where such an offer was made. The point is noted by teachers and theologians on both sides of the Atlantic. For instance, George Ladd, in his book *Crucial Questions about the Kingdom of God,* says:

> Jesus did not offer to the Jews the earthly kingdom *anymore than he offered himself to them as their glorious earthly king.* Here we may take our stand on firm ground.[24]

The British writer who signed himself "Touchstone," writing in the leading Brethren publication, *The Witness,* notes:

> The postponement of the kingdom which has been popularized by the Scofield Bible, but which in our judgment, lacks entirely any Scriptural basis. Christ came to die, not to establish His earthly kingdom, and it is good that this doctrine has largely been set aside for what it is worth.[25]

When he wrote, "Touchstone" had not spent any time around either Greenville, South Carolina, or Dallas, Texas, or Lynchburg, Viriginia. Even though attacked and somewhat beleagured, the "postponement idea" has more vitality than is good for either the church or for persons living at the eastern end of the Mediterranean.

Daniel P. Fuller has note:

> If the Dispensationalist affirms that the Davidic kingdom was offered at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, there must have been some point where the offer was withdrawn, because Christ was crucified at the end of his ministry.[26]

Pointing out difficulties in the Dispensational system, Fuller notes that the withdrawal cannot be found:

> The dispensational problem of exactly when Jesus withdrew the offer to establish the glorious Davidic kingdom for the Jews would also vanish, along with the attempt to distinguish between the "moral rejection," the "official rejection," and the "final official rejection."[27]

Unfortunately, not only in this message, but throughout his teaching, Scofield holds to the "Postponed Kingdom" theory. Now the kingdom subject was very much in the mind of the Spirit who inspired the Word. Philip Mauro points out that the kingdom subject is mentioned 139 times in the New Testament.[28] But of the 139, Scofield avoids comment on 118 of the 139 passages, Why? Because those 118 verses could not sustain his "Postponed Kingdom" theory.

Thus Scofield, to protect his views violates a principle laid down in the introduction to that very work:

> II. The last fifty years have witnessed an intensity and breadth of interest in Bible study unprecedented in the history of the Christian Church. Never before have so many reverent, learned, and spiritual men brought to the study of the Scriptures minds so free from merely controversial motive. A new and vast exegetical and expository literature has been created, inaccessible for bulk, cost, and time to the average reader. The winnowed and attested results of this half-century of Bible study are embodied in the notes, summaries, and definitions of this edition. Expository novelties and merely personal views and interpretations, have been rejected.

Pertinent particularly to the issue here:

> IV. All of the connected topical lines of reference end in analytic summaries of the whole teaching of Scripture on that subject, thus guarding the reader against hasty generalizations from a few passages or proof texts. The saying that "anything may be proved by the Bible" is both true and false—true if isolated passages are used; utterly false if the whole divine revelation is in view.[29]

If 118 out of 139 verses on a subject are not commented on, then his purpose, declared under Roman numeral IV is not carried out. Yet this failure protected the position which he was propounding on this second day of the conference.

Typical of verses which have not received the benefit of Scofield's wisdom are (with page in his work): Matt. 18:3 (SRB 1024), Matt. 19:14 (SRB 1025), Mark 10:14 (SRB 1058), Luke 18:17 (SRB 1101), Luke 16:16 (SRB 1098). Note also Scofield's handling of verses dealing with those whom he claimed rejected the Kingdom. See Luke 17:20,21 (SRB 1100) and John 18:38 (SRB 1141).[30]

Careful consideration of those passages support the idea that Scofield's great work has actually a semantic device to promote certain ideas. It should not be considered objective Biblical scholarship. The idea being promoted as he told the *Titanic* story is one of the most blatant examples.

It may be more than coincidence that Philip Mauro was the one to point out a serious fallacy of the "Postponed Kingdom" idea. In a study "Dispensationalism Justifies the Crucifixion," Mauro notes:

> The question which a modern system of doctrine that has found acceptance with many orthodox Christians forces upon us is this:
>
> > Did our Lord, during His earthly ministry, either commit (or authorize others to commit) overt acts, or utter (or authorize His disciples to utter) words of treasonable or seditious import? Did He ever commit or authorize acts or utter or authorize words in their nature subversive of the then subsisting government of the land? Specifically did He ever present or announce Himself as an earthly King, the claimant of David's throne? Did he ever offer to the oppressed people of Judea, either in person or through the lips of His disciples, the earthly kingdom they had been taught to expect?

> Had He ever, by word or act, sought to incite insurrection against the rule of Caesar, or given any countenance whatever to the political ambitions of the Jews?[31]

Mauro discussed the point with another Christian lawyer. This man brought out a point which explodes the "Postponed Kingdom" theory:

> It is this: "Manifestly, had the Lord uttered a single word that could have been construed as a proclamation or suggestion that He was about to claim the throne, or would accept it, there would have been thousands of witnesses to prove the accusation. But there was no proof forthcoming. And be it noted that anything which would prove today our friends' theory, would have proved then the accusation which the priests and Pharisses brought against the Lord before Pilate."
>
> That last sentence puts the whole case in a nut shell; and I do not see how anyone can get away from it. It is surprising to me that Dr. Scofield being a lawyer by profession, and for many years in actual practice, did not see this as a fatal objection to his theory, but then as I say, I wholly missed the point myself until my attention was called to it in your book.[32]

The fact that Dispensational teachers overlook the lawyer's point suggests that their thought is either shoddy or predetermined. And in the lawyer's last statement, we see one consequence of the Dispensational heirarchy being, even up to the time of writing, far from candid about Scofield's life. Had that lawyer friend of Mauro known that Scofield's legal experience appears to have consisted of one unpaid express bill, the family land case, caucusing in smoke-filled rooms and chasing Indians on the prairie, he would have understood Scofield's lack of legal perception.

To return to 1914, Scofield's second message was delivered in the morning. The attendees adjourned, probably for lunch. The published report makes no mention of fasting, even in the face of the impending doom vividly described by so many speakers.

In the third message, Scofield went right into his view of The Epistles and The Revelation. Overlooking statements of the Lord and the Apostles which did not suit his purpose, he proclaims his negative hope for the church. Speaking of the Parable of The Wheat and The Tares, he says:

> It is not a statement that there should be through this whole period wicked men in the world. It is a statement that in the very sphere of profession there would be"the children of the wicked one", so closely resembling the true children of the Kingdom that human servants could not be trusted to effect a separation.[33]

This, of course, overlooks Christ's statement that "the gates of Hell would not prevail against the Church." Scofield, by referring to the Church as the "true children of the kingdom," is blithely inconsistent with the system which is his major thesis. Going on, he says:

> The prophecies concerning the Church are simple. The professing Church goes into apostasy (2 Thess. 2:3; 1 Tim. 4:1; 2 Tim. 3:1-8; 4:3,4; 2 Pet. 2:1-3; Jude 1-25; Rev. 3:14-18). As the Spirit of prophecy looks down the history of the visible Church, the professing Church, He does not see a converted world, with upturned faces, praising God, waiting for the descending King. The prophetic picture of the close of the earthly pathway of the Church as a professing body, the visible Church, is one of wide-spread declension and departure from the truth.[34]

Continuing, he referred to the passage where the Dispensationalists are probably as inaccurate as at any place in Scripture. (If the passage is properly interpreted, we may get a clue as to the reason young Saul of Tarsus was apprenticed as a tent-maker.) He quoted Acts 15:14-17, then said:

> There is a great passage that clears all obscurity, in the broad sense, from the interpretation of unfulfilled prophecy. The Lord is now calling out from the Gentiles a people for His name. That is obvious. Never anywhere has the gospel failed to call out some. Never anywhere, for nineteen hundred years, has it converted everybody. The apostle Paul said he had fully preached the gospel in the regions of Syria and Asia Minor. Did he mean to say that he had converted everybody in Syria and Asia Minor? No; but he had evangelized them. He brought men right up before the cross, and some fell at the pierced feet while some turned away. So it has been, and so it is now. It is the time of the out-call; and that is what the word "Church" means, "the called-out assembly."[35]

We agree that the passage "clears all obscurity" but not as the Dispensationalists use it. They try to make a passage of political, secular, governmental significance. They fail to take the quoted passage back beyond Amos.

Amos was referring to the Tabernacle (tent) of David erected on Mt. Zion to hold the Ark of the Covenant when David brought it up to Jerusalem (at the time he wrote the 24th Psalm). The event is described in II Samuel 8. The Hebrew word for tent or tabernacle makes the reference very clear. There is not space to develop the theme here. Study of the books of Samuel and Kings and the Psalms make it clear that the services in the Tabernacle of David were very similar to the pattern traditionally observed in evangelical churches. The Dispensational claim that Acts 15:18 refers to Israel or a political kingdom is incorrect. The Tabernacle of David was a type of the church. The Dispensational claim that the church is not found in the Old Testameant is here exploded.

Why was Saul (Paul) a tent-maker? As he traveled through Asia and Europe planting and building churches, he, a tent-maker, was carrying out the prophecy of Amos, "rebuilding the Tabernacle of David which is fallen down."

Scofield concluded the message with:

> I want to tell you another thing: I am not looking for death. I may pass to Him in that way, surely I may; but I am not looking and waiting for death. I am looking and waiting for Him, and He knows it. Oh, may God bless you, dear friends. Who are we, that we should be privileged to sit here under the teaching of these men of God! How wonderful this conference is. I have never seen anything like this. The spirit is the spirit of old Niagara, as some of you veterans know, but it is Niagara multiplied by about ten. Thank God for giving us this conference! May God bless you![36]

But despite Scofield's fond hope, he was not raptured, a fact confirmed by legal documents which support the story in chapter 38. Whatever the Lord "knew" about Scofield, He did know that Scofield was not going to be raptured. The Lord never, never gives His people incorrect ideas. Where did Scofield get this idea he would be "raptured"?

Convinced that they would be raptured with Scofield, the delegates left the meeting. Most of them went to lunch. Charles G. Trumbull relates what Scofield did:

> One of the first impressions I ever had of Dr. Scofield was as to the ease with which people could get to him. It was at the time of the great Prophetic Conference held in Chicago in February of 1914, less than six months before the storm of the world war broke. He gave a fearless Scriptural message on the assurance in God's Word that world-wide and permanent peace can never come save by the coming of the Prince of Peace, though that message was laughed at by the general public and newspaper reporters at that time. I think this was the first time I had ever seen or heard Dr. Scofield, and I hoped I might get his autograph in my personal copy of the Scofield Reference Bible.
>
> At the close of one of his addresses I sought him out, and found that others had the same desire. And I supposed that a man of his prominence, so much in demand for public addresses, must be more or less annoyed by the importunity of strangers coming to him and "bothering" him for an autograph. Even then he was about to leave the church to catch a train. But he greeted every individual who came up to him at the close of that meeting, even as he greeted me, then an entire stranger, as though we were all doing him a personal favor by letting him write in our Bibles! I think I have never seen such genuine courtesy and unaffected Christian love in a conference speaker or Bible teacher as I saw in him at that time, and as I have seen in him many times since.[37]

It is amazing to us that Trumbull and Scofield had not met previously, especially in view of their many common interests and Trumbull's evident journalistic skill. However, all things are possible. One result of the meeting was that Trumbull secured the services of Scofield to write for his paper, *The Sunday School Times*.[38]

Since the last day of the conference was Friday, the train that Scofield was about to catch was most likely for New York. He probably went from Moody Church to the Union Station on the first leg of his regurn to Douglaston.

CHAPTER 32 NOTES

1. The *Kingdom and Coming of Christ,* BICA, Chicago, 1914, p. 9.
2. *Ibid.,* pp. 11, 12.
3. Richard Ellsworth Day, *Breakfast Table Autocrat,* Moody Press, 1946, p. 168.
4. So Day described Dr. Gray, *Ibid.,* p. 167.
5. Letter Wilbur Smith to Day, *ibid.,* p. 168.
6. Scofield's role as an "authority" went through some changes. In 1896 he was the expert to straighten out D. L. Moody. In 1905, in the Lotos Club letter, he deferred to Gaebelein. In 1914, he is an "authority."
7. Trumbull, *op. cit.,* p. 121.
8. C. I. Scofield, "The Doctrine of Last Things as Found in the Prophets," in *The Kingdom and Coming of Christ,* BICA, 1914, p. 40.
9. *Ibid.,* p. 41.
10. *Ibid.,* p. 43.
11. *Ibid.,* p. 45.
12. See chapter 11.
13. Scofield, *The Doctrine . . . Prophets,* p. 47.
14. *Ibid.,* p. 49.
15. Scofield, "The Doctrine of Last Things as Found in the Gospels," in *The Kingdom and Coming of Christ,* BICA, 1914, p. 115.
16. As noted in the previous chapter, *The Northern Whig* was reviewed by Rev. Adam Loughridge of the Reformed Presbytarian Seminary, Belfast.
17. Scofield apparently convinced himself. In a letter written May 4, 1921, to his daughter, Abigail Kellogg, he said that the message "The Unsinkable Ship" would be included in his sermon collection *In Many Pulpits With Dr. C. I. Scofield.* The table of contents of the book (Oxford Univ. Press, 1922), does not list such a title and there is no sermon resembling it in the collection. *The Sunday School Times,* in its memorial article after Scofield's death (Vol. LXIII, 33, page 535, Aug. 13, 1921), contained the following: "How Dr. Scofield's whole life was an illustration of the way in which opportunities come to one who lives his life in the sweep of the Holy Spirit's guidance, was dwelt upon by another speaker, as he related the incident of a visit by Dr. Scofield to Belfast, Ireland, just at the time when the *Titanic, "the* unsinkable ship", built at and sailing from Belfast, had sunk in the mid-Atlantic after collison with an iceberg. There were newly-made widows and orphans in Belfast then because not a few of the workmen on the *Titanic* had gone across on this maiden voyage as part of her crew. There was a tenseness of feeling over the whole city which kept men from prosecuting their business with calmness and deliberation, and to break the spell of sadness a great mass-meeting had been arranged for the coming Sunday afternoon. The Mayor of the city asked Dr. Scofield to bring the message. God seemed to say to him that he should speak about the only unsinkable ship, the little craft upon which our Lord sailed across Galilee. Dr. Scofield drew from this incident wonderful lessons of comfort and help for the people of that bereaved city as he pointed out that there was safety for time and eternity only in the Lord Jesus Christ." This relation has details added which Scofield had not included in the original presentation.
18. All references to the Mauros and their *Titanic* involvement are from Gardner, *Champion of The Kingdom,* Bread of Life, New York, 1961, p. 44 ff.
19. *Ibid.,* p. 42.
20. *Ibid.* In the letter Mauro refers to his book, *The World and Its God.* Published in 1907, in the early days of Mauro's Christian experience, it displays the essential pessimism which would have delighted J. N. Darby and made Scofield and Gaebelein quite happy. Its tone conflicts with the logic of the position which Mauro moved to

in *The Gospel of The Kingdom* and other works after World War I. The *World and Its God* was recently reissued by a press which has not recognized Mauro's other works. We cannot be sure that the later Mauro would have approved of the reissue.

21. Note that Mauro and Scofield were both lawyers, both had two daughters. Mauro was successful in his chosen field, in contrast to Scofield. Mauro's two daughters joined their father in the faith. Mauro was able to publicly acknowledge his daughters. He participated in the wedding (only one daughter married). There were some differences!
22. Scofield, *Doctrine . . . Gospels,* p. 115.
23. Page citation from the 1917 Edition.
24. George E. Ladd, *Crucial Questions about the Kingdom of God,* Eerdmanns, 1952, p. 113.
25. Touchstone *(nom de plume)* writing in "A Short-Lived Journal" in *The Witness,* London, 1972, p. 262. *The Witness* is the official publication of the Brethren in England. The 1972 view is in contrast to the view of Scofield's writings in a review when *Addresses in Prophecy* came out in 1910. In the English edition (Pickering and Inglis), entitled *Prophecy Made Plain,* the publishers included this comment: "Many Christians seem to have a kind of dread for anything associated with the word "prophecy", and consequently leave the study of it alone. To all such, and to Christians generally, we would commend this volume. By a perusal of this book a commencement may be made, along simple lines, with the study of this fascinating and important theme." *(The Witness).*

    We penetrated the *nom de plume of* the 1972 writer. He assured us that the comment in the text is good Brethren position in the 1970's and 1980's.
26. Daniel P. Fuller, *Gospel & Law, Contrast or Continuum?,* Eerdmanns, 1980, p. 157.
27. *Ibid.,* p. 161.
28. Philip R. Mauro, *The Gospel of The Kingdom with an Examination of Modern Dispensationalism,* currently available from Reiner Publications, Sweagal, Pa.
29. Unnumbered page, Introduction to the 1917 edition, *The Scofield Reference Bible.*
30. Page citation from the 1917 edition. We find no comment on any of these verses in Scofield's work.
31. Originally published in his work *God's Present Kingdom.* The relevant portion was reissued as *Dispensationalism Justifies The Crucifixion,* by Reiner Publications, Swengal, Pa., p. 6.
32. Mauro, *op. cit.,* p. 20.
33. Scofield, "The Doctrine of Last Things Found" in The Epistles and Revelation, in *The Kingdom and Coming of Christ,* BICA, 1914, p. 175.
34. *Ibid.,* p. 177.
35. *Ibid.,* pp. 178, 179. The true significance of The Tabernacle of David has been obfuscated by the entire Premillennial movement. We know of but one work which treats on the subject. It is: *The Harmony of Divine Dispensations,* "Being A Series of Discourses on Select Portions of the Holy Scripture, Designed to Show the Spirituality, Efficacy, and Harmony of Divine Revelations made to Mankind from the Beginning," by George Smith. Smith was a Cornish Wesleyan preacher, mining engineer, railway official and writer. The first edition was issued by Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans, London 1856. The American edition came out shortly thereafter from Carlton & Porter and went into three editions. We know of only one or two copies extant. Since it was so widely circulated originally, its disappearance is most strange. Could it have been the subject of an intentional, quiet Dispensational book-burning? We wonder!
36. Scofield, *op. cit.,* p. 182.
37. Trumbull, *op. cit.,* p. 121.
38. BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 86.

CHAPTER 33

Prophecy Enters Good Society

> *"But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father."*
>
> Mark 13:23

One writer has suggested that at the 1914 prophecy conference ". . . prophecy thereupon got out of its rags and entered good society."[1] In the previous chapter, we considered Scofield's part in the conference. A further look at the published report of the event[2] has established that the negative bias of Scofield's message was not uniquely associated with the Tennessean from Michigan. But was that negative bias really good for society?

Let us start with the words of the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. As His earthly ministry was nearing its end, He told men (followers, listeners): "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, not the angels in heaven, but my father only" *(Matt. 24:36)*.

The organizers of the 1914 conference belonged to a group which gave ostensible lip service to that statement of the Lord. But their action in scheduling the conference belied their words. If the 12 men who signed the conference call[3] had not made some determinations about the time they expected the Lord to rapture the church, they would never have issued the call phrased as it was. Without some judgment as to at least an approximate time for that event, the whole bias of the conference would have been different.

Brethren writer F. Roy Coad has stated:

> It is here useful to notice on interesting fact. Almost invariably interpretation has been vitiated by the reluctance or incapacity of commentators to visualize their own age as other than the end time. As a consequence, beliefs are in a constant state of revision and restatement.[4]

Such revision makes last year's prophecy more outdated than last year's fashion in women's dress. Fashions can and do come back. But prophecy, especially when linked to secular events, cannot come back. This should make thoughtful people pause.

There is an aspect, not noted by other commentators, which may be downright evil. If the Father, as our Lord stated, is not going to reveal to any man the time of the Son's return, then any man who claims an inkling of that time, is mistaken. But he also cannot have gotten his mistaken idea from the Lord of Glory. This must have been

true of the 12 men who signed the call of 1914. So where did they get the idea?

Analysis of the published record of the 1914 conference suggests that what at that time entered "good society" would have been better left outside, Richard Ellsworth Day to the contrary. Space does not permit comment on every message. But one message, besides Scofield's, will give new focus, we feel, to the prophecy movement.

Between Scofield's first and second message on the "kingdom," a message entitled "Second Coming in Relation to Evangelism" was delivered by the Rev. Leander W. Munhall, evangelist, of Germantown, Pennsylvania.[5] Some of Munhall's statements seem incredible.[6]

Munhall appeared to subscribe to Scofield's idea of "evangelization, not conversion." He said:

> Our business is to publish the glad tidings to earth's remotest bounds, that all may know the good news. It is the business of Jesus to save—He alone can do it: "God our Saviour; who willeth that all men should be saved" (1 Tim. 2:4). But many say, "We will not that this man reign over us (Luke 19:14); and He said of such "And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life (John 5:40). He, of course, knows who is the last one to be saved. "And then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father, when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet" (1 Cor. 15:24,25).

When he talks about Christ reigning, the context shows that he actually defers this to a latter age. The whole business of preaching without concern about results makes the activity seem like running in a squirrel cage.

In the next paragraph, Munhall departs from reality:

> The most eloquent language and vivid imagery possible to human thought are used to describe the rapture of the Church and unfading glories of the Kingdom that is to subdue all other kingdoms: no more tears; no more sin; no more death; no more curse. War, pestilence, famine, storm, earthquake, sickness, old age, heartache—all forever done away.

Munhall could not have been more wrong on one thing. The idea of the Rapture (so profitable for Hal Lindsay) is *not* anywhere in the Scripture described in "vivid imagery." The Rapture idea is based on a very highly questionable use of three verses in I Thessalonians, verses in a message written by Paul for an entirely different purpose. Even Rev. Cornelius Stam of Chicago, an ultra-Dispensationalist, admits that the usual Rapture pictures (of wrecked automobiles all over the streets after believing drivers are "raptured" out from behind the wheel) says, "Yet the Scriptures do not say *one word* about all this."[7] This admission of Stam confirms our view that much teaching of Fundamentalism is based on fantasy, not real Biblical interpretation.[8]

Munhall then "raptured" over the Niagara Bible Conference:

> We used to look forward with great anticipation, as we have looked forward to this conference, to the old Niagara Conference gatherings. We would be planning for weeks and months to get together; and the best part of it all was the fellowship we had. That fellowshp, as in the fellowship here, was so delightful that if there were no other reason for our coming together, that alone would justify it. . . .

We noted in a previous chapter the unusual phenomenon of the Niagara Conference—grown men sitting around in comfortable surroundings quitely "rapturing" over the likelihood of famine, suffering, persecution and horrible death for others, but very definitely not for themselves.

Continuing, Munhall tried to legitimize his position and that of the conference by very selective quotations from Luther and Calvin:

> Luther once said:
>
> "Some say that before the last day the world shall become Christian. That is a falsehood, forged by Satan, that he might darken sound doctrine." John Calvin said: "There is no reason why any person should expect the conversion of the world, for at length—when it will be too late, and will yield to them no advantage—they will look on Him Whom they have pierced. Moreover it must be held as a first principle that, ever since the appearing of Christ, there is nothing left to the faithful but with wakeful minds to be always ready, intent on his second advent."[9]

We have not found a study of Luther with specific relation to his views on the Second Coming. Calvin's writings have been studied and from those studies, we hold that Munhall's quotation (without citation) takes something out of the context of Calvin's message.

In 1955, John Knox Press issued *Calvin's Doctrine of the Last Things* by Heinrich Quistorp. It concludes that Calvin's views in no way coincided with those of the 1914 conference. While we admit to this study's issue 40 years later, we do suggest that Munhall's statement was not accurate nor made on the basis of true scholarship.[10]

Then in the Winter 1878-77 issue of the *Journal of Christian-Reconstruction,* subtitled "Symposium on The Millennium," Greg L. Bahnsen devoted eight pages of an essay entitled "The Prima Facie Acceptability of Postmillennialism" to a survey of Calvin's views of eschatology.[11] Conclusion: Calvin would never have been invited to a Dispensational prophecy "bash." Another indication that Pre-millennialists are short of scholarship.

To further attempt to legitimize his position, Munhall then says: "I had a personal acquaintance and fellowship with the late Charles Haddon Spurgeon, an out-and-out Premillennialist." Now Munhall is not mentioned in most Spurgeon studies and while Spurgeon did adopt a sort of Premillennialism in his later years, it was only after he had

suffered defeat after defeat in Baptist groups as he battled the entry of liberalism. Rev. Norman Street of the Jarvis Baptist Church in Toronto placed this quotation from Spurgeon in *The Gospel Witness,* Dec. 27, 1984, issue:

> We anticipate the happy day when the whole world shall be converted to Christ; when the gods of the heathen shall be cast to the moles and the bats; when Romanism shall be exploded, and the crescent of Mohammed shall wane, never again to cast its baneful rays upon the nations; when kings shall bow down before the Prince of Peace, and all nations shall call their Redeemer blessed. Some despair of this. They look upon the world as a vessel breaking up and going to pieces, never to float again. We know that the world and all that is therein is one day to be burnt up, and afterwards we look for new heavens and for a new earth; but we cannot read our Bibles without the conviction that—
>
> "Jesus shall reign where'er the sun
> Does his successive journeys run."
>
> We are not discouraged by the length of His delays; we are not disheartened by the long period which he allots to the church in which to struggle with little success and much defeat. We believe that God will never suffer this world, which has once seen Christ's blood shed upon it, to be always the devil's stronghold. Christ came hither to deliver this world from the detested sway of the powers of darkness. What a shout shall that be when men and angels shall unite to cry, "Hallelujah, hallelujah, for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth!" What a satisfaction will it be in that day to have had a share in the fight, to have helped to break the arrows of the bow, and to have aided in winning the victory for our Lord! Happy are they who trust themselves with this conquering Lord, and who fight side by side with Him, doing their little in His name and by His strength! How unhappy are those on the side of evil! It is a losing side, and it is a matter wherein to lose is to lose and to be lost for ever. On whose side are you?[12]

If the prophecy buffs of Victorian England (including the "deluded" Plymouth Brethren, had held to a better vision of the church and its role, Spurgeon might have seen the victory he describes in the quotation above. Somehow Munhall's statement seems to be lacking in veracity.

Continuing his pessimillenarian message of hopelessness, Munhall refers to the hymn writers of the 18th and 19th centuries:

> Charles Wesley was known as "the millennial poet." He wrote over 7,000 hymns, and more than 5,000 were premillennial. Here are two or three samples:
>
> "Lo! He comes, with clouds descending,
> Once for favored sinners slain.
> Thousand thousand saints attending,
> Swell the triumph of His train.
> Hallelujah! Hallelujah!
> God appears on earth to reign."
>
> "Come, Lord, Thy glorious Spirit cries,
> Add souls beneath the altar groan;

Come, Lord, the Bride on earth replies,
And perfect all our souls in one."

"Thou Who hast kept us to this hour,
Oh, keep us faithful to the end;
When, robed in majesty and power
Our Jesus shall from heaven descent,
His friends and witnesses to own,
And seat us on His glorious throne."

Denny, Milton, Cowper, Watts, Bathurst, Montgomery, Newton, Alford and McCheyne, sang the same sweet songs of hope and victory.[13]

But the "sweet songs of hope and victory" of the hymn writers was *not* the failing-church-quick-escape hope of the conference. It is simply not correct to fit these men into the pattern of Scofield and Hal Lindsay.

Munhall may have made his "value judgment" after perusing hymnals compiled in America by Dispensationalists to use at prophecy conferences. If he had looked at hymnals used in British churches or at American hymnals of the early 18th Century, he could not have supported his allegation of the Premillennial bias of the great hymn writers.

We made a study (so far unpublished) comparing hymns as published in British and American hymnals. (Note that British congregations sing all stanzas printed, no matter how many.) The British hymnals do include *all* stanzas which came from the pen and inspiration of the writers. American compilers, especially of Dispensational bent, have done a workman-like job of editing hymns of the great writers. Stanza after stanza sing of the triumph of the church and the dominion of our Lord have been edited out. The edit in the American hymnals which thus reflect the "Failing Church Syndrome" suggests a determination to shape (or brainwash) the constituency by every available means. This is intellectual dishonesty.

Analysis of the other 1914 conference messages strengthens our point that the whole affair was built on a skewed bias. As the conference was ending, a committee prepared a set of resolutions published as *The Conference Testimony.* The committee appointed by Dr. Gray during a meeting of speakers on the second day of the conference consisted of: Dr. Robert McW. Russell, president of Westminster College (Pennsylvania); The Rev. Canon F.E. Howitt of Hamilton, Ontario; The Rev. Dr. R.A. Torrey, dean of The Bible Institute, Los Angeles; A.C. Gaebelein, editor of *Our Hope,* New York City; The Rev. Dr. L.W. Munhall of Germantown (Pennsylvania). The report was presented and unanimously adopted "on the afternoon of the last day when nearly 2,000 people were present." The report read:

The brethren gathered for the Conference on the Prophetic Scriptures heartily indorse the declarations made by the previous prophetic con-

ferences; but also feel it their solemn duty in view of the existing conditions of the professing church, to restate and reaffirm their unswerving belief in the following fundamental truths of our holy faith:

1. We believe that the Bible is the Word and Revelation of God and therefore our only authority.
2. We believe in the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, that He is very God by Whom and for Whom "all things were created."
3. We believe in his Virgin Birth, that he was conceived by the Holy Spirit and is therefore God manifested in the flesh.
4. We believe in Salvation by Divine Sacrifice, that the Son of God gave "His life a ransom for many" and bore "our sins in His own body on the tree."
5. We believe in His physical Resurrection from the dead and in His bodily presence at the right hand of God as our Priest and Advocate.
6. We believe in the universality and heinousness of Sin, and in Salvation by Grace, "not of works, lest any man should boast"; that sonship with God is attained only be regeneration through the Holy Spirit and faith in Jesus Christ.
7. We believe in the Personality and Deity of the Holy Spirit, Who came down upon earth on the day of Pentecost to indwell believers and to be the Administrator in the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ; Who is also here to "reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment."
8. We believe in the Great Commission, which our Lord has given to His Church to evangelize the world, and this evangelization is the great mission of the Church.
9. We believe in the second, visible and imminent Coming of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ to establish His world-wide Kingdom on the earth.
10. We believe in a Heaven of eternal bliss for the righteous, and in the conscious and eternal punishment of the wicked.

Furthermore, we exhort the people of God in all denominations to stand by these great truths, so much rejected in our days, and to contend earnestly for the faith which our God has, in His Holy Word, delivered unto the saints.[14]

Had anyone suggested to the nearly 2,000 people on that last day of the conference in 1914 that we could be writing about the conference more than 70 years later, they would have looked at the speaker with as much disbelief as Neatby reports of the early Plymouth Brethren. They probably would have had serious reservations about the orthodoxy or sanity of anyone who so suggested. Yet, passage of time has shown that they were just as deluded as Neatby considered the early Brethren to have been.

When the conference messages were published, there was included an appendix with a list of individuals identified as "Some Exponents of Premillennialism." Since the list of supposed exponents had originally appeared as an editorial in *The Christian Workers Magazine,* it must bear the imprint of Dr. Gray. The list is headed by a short essay:

> By "premillennialism" is meant the teaching that our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ will come again to this earth personally and visibly, and that this coming will take place prior to that period of a thousand years of which the Scriptures speak, when peace and righteousness shall prevail upon the earth. In other words, it is the coming of our Lord that shall introduce this period and make it a possibility. As to the details of the event opinions differ among godly students of the Bible, but in broad outline the foregoing is a sufficient definition for our present purpose.[15]

The list is strictly in alphabetical order without regard for century. And asterisk does mark off those deceased at time of publication. As the list includes those in the generation of Fathers who immediately succeeded the Apostles, we quote again from Brethren writer F. Roy Coad, whose comment is pertinent to the use of the Early Fathers by Dr. Gray:

> Few fragments have survived from the earliest years of the Church's history, and it would be *wrong* to read into the ideas of such fragments as we have any of our modern formulated systems. Their one supreme hope was the Second Advent, and detail was of secondary importance.[16]

For Gray to include medieval schoolmen is out of line as they could in no way properly be called on to support American Dispensationalism. Philip Edgecombe Hughes' volume *The Theology of the English Reformers,* makes it clear that Gray is out of line by including Cranmer or Latimer.[17] Nor can we countenance the inclusion of mystics like Jacob Boehme. Nor should Count Zinzendorf be placed in the Evangelical mainstream.

To include Jesuit Lacunza or the eccentric Edward Irving must raise questions about Gray's motivation. In view of the disputes which racked the Brethren in early days, linking so casually Darby, Newton and Tregelles is inconsiderate.

There is at least one outright error. David Bogue, listed by Gray, said in 1813:

> How wise and pious men could ever suppose that the saints, whose souls are now in heaven, should, after the resurrection of the body from the grave, descend to live on earth again; and that Jesus Christ should quit the throne of his glory above, and descend and reign personally over them here below, in distinguished splendour, for a thousand years, may justly excite our astonishment, since it is in direct opposition to the whole tenor of the doctrinal parts of the sacred volume. Such, however, have been the opinions of some great men. Happy will it be if we take warning from their aberrations.[18]

Obviously, he does not belong on Gray's list.

There are two remarkable omissions from the list. The first is Sydney Watson, author of the soap-opera type novel on the Rapture, *In the Twinkling of an Eye,* which is the inspiration for so much Rapture-cult preaching. We tried to read a biography of Watson and could not

decide whether it was about one or two men. The other omission is that of the "noted Bible teacher," Walter Scott, referred to by Scofield. We finally located and confirmed the existence of Scott but for some reason Gray did not find room for a "noted Bible teacher."

Gray was later criticized for making the list and for its inclusions.[19] We get an impression that he was attempting to overwhelm at the sacrifice of scholarly integrity. Many of his inclusions may have been made on the assumption that most readers would never bother to check his accuracy.

This sort of thing does not commend the movement. And this is what Day suggested was entering "good society."

CHAPTER 33 NOTES

1. Richard Ellsworth Day, *Breakfast Table Autocrat: The Life Story of Henry Parson Crowell,* Moody Press, 1946, p. 168.
2. Published as *The Kingdom and Coming of Christ,* Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago, 1914.
3. John Timothy Stone, Robert N. Russell, Wm. G. Moorehead, E. Y. Mullins, T. R. O'Meara, W. H. Griffith Thomas, C. I. Scofield, H. B. Hartzler, A. C. Gaebelein, R. A. Torrey, James M. Gray.
4. F. Roy Coad, *Prophetic Developments,* a Christian Brethren Research Fellowship Occasional Paper, CBRF, Pinner, Middlesex, England, 1966, p. 10.
5. Since this writer was born and grew up in Germantown, Pa., we looked up Munhall's residence. He lived at 226 W. Harvey Street, a street of large homes, many three-story, sitting high on the embankments reached by long rows of concrete steps. It was a street of upper, middle-level management types. (The doctor who officiated at the writer's birth lived just around the corner.) Munhall lived until 1934 and this writer many times passed his house. Certainly, Munhall's hope for immediate rapture did not interfere with comfortable living in a middle-class, prosperous neighborhood. How many neighbors appreciated his views of the Rapture may be questioned.
6. *The Kingdom and Coming of Christ,* p. 94ff.
7. Cornelius Stam, "The Imminence of The Raputre, Its Two Most Urgent Lessons," in *The Berean Searchlight,* Chicago, January 1985, Vol. XLV, No. 10, p. 293. Stam is the brother of John Stam, missionary martyred by Chinese Communists in 1935.
8. In 1979, Robert Jewett published *Jesus Against The Rapture* (Westminster, Philadelphia). Jewett holds that on the basis of Mark 13:32-33, Luke 10:17-20, Luke 4:16-30, Matt. 16:1-4, Matt. 23:39-39, Luke 28:28-31 and Luke 23:14-17, Jesus Himself could not in any way approve of the idea of the Rapture as expounded by Scofield, Sydney, Watson or Hal Lindsay.
9. *The Kingdom and Coming of Christ,* p. 94ff.
10. Heinrich Quistorp, *Calvin's Doctrine of the Last Things,* trans. Harold Knight, John Knox Press, 1955.
11. *The Journal of Christian Reconstruction* is a publication of Chalcedon, Vallecito, Calif. At the last word, we knew of not one premillennial Evangelical school which had bothered to acknowledge the publication of the *Journal,* nor dared to expose its students to the *Journal's* message of Christian Hope.
12. *The Gospel Witness,* Jarvis Street Baptist Church, Toronto.
13. *The Kingdom and Coming of Christ,* p. 96.
14. *Ibid.,* p. 239.
15. *The Christian Workers Magazine* was a predecessor to *Moody Monthly.*

16. Coad, *op. cit.*, p. 11. (Emphasis added.)
17. Published by Eerdmanns, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1965.
18. David Bogue, *Discourses on the Millennium*, 1818, p. 17, quoted in Iain Murray, *The Puritan Hope*, The Banner of Truth, 1971, p. 187.
19. Timothy Weber, in chapter one of *Living in the Shadow of The Second Coming* (Oxford, 1979) comments on Gray's list and notes that Gray was widely criticitized at the time over the integrity of his list. Gray later made other statements which needlessly caused trouble for his administration and school.

CHAPTER 34

A New School and a New Church

"Thou gavest also thy good spirit to instruct them, and withheldest not thy manna from their mouth, and gavest them water for their thirst."

Neh. 9:20

> No analysis of the structure of the Fundamentalist movement can proceed very far if the role of the Bible institute is ignored. A great deal of the confusion which has existed over the nature of the Fundamentalist movement could have been resolved by devoting more attention to this aspect of the problem. Fundamentalism was a part of both the intellectual and the social history of the United States—that is, its thought can be identified, analyzed, and placed in historical context. Its institutional structure possesses some of the same distinctiveness. By assuming that the faith of Fundamentalism simply reflected traditional Protestantism, scholars have lost one key to understanding; and by failing to examine the manner in which the Bible institutes provided a form of social structure for Fundamentalism, they have lost another.[1]

Ernest Sandeen appears to be the first writer to recognize the phenomenon. He explains the role of the Bible institute:

> The simplest way to explain the function of the Bible institute within the Fundamentalist movement is to compare its role to that of the headquarters of a denomination. In many cases, the educational task of the institute, though never derogated, formed only a small part of the school's total mission. Students would be drawn to a Bible institute because of its reputation as a center of piety and sound doctrine, as these concepts had been understood in the millenarian tradition. Perhaps the family of the student had heard of the school through its periodical or had heard one of its faculty preach at a Bible conference or in a series of special meetings in their local church. Possibly their own pastor graduated from the school.[2]

Scofield recognized or felt what Sandeen spelled out. He was greatly interested in having a Bible institute on the East Coast.[3] He hoped it would occupy a role similar to that played by Moody in the Midwest. His desire seemed to be realized by the establishment of such an institute in Philadelphia.

The spade work of organizing and opening the school went on during 1914. William L. Pettengill of Philadelphia, in association with others, worked out the arrangements.[4] Bearing the name "Philadelphia School of the Bible," the school opened October 1, 1914, with evening classes. It met in rented quarters at 1720 Arch Street. Scofield addressed the opening session. His message, "The Spirit and Method of Bible Study," commenced:

> I suppose, dear friends, it is well understood that I am to speak tonight on "Spirit and Method of Bible Study." It can scarcely be necessary for me to explain the sense in which I use the work "spirit" in this connection. As absolutely essential as it is that we shall have the illuminating power of the Holy Spirit, it is not of Him that I speak in making the theme such as I have made it, but rather of our own attitude toward the Bible, of our own spirits, of our own spiritial state as we approach the study of God's Holy Word. We may come to the Bible cold and merely inquisitive, and it will give us very little. We may come to it in a mere curiosity, because it is a strange book, differing fundamentally from all other books, and we shall go away largely disappointed. It is certainly one of the paradoxes of life that the Bible is so little read—that Book which is the most widely circulated of all books; that Book which, broadly speaking is in every home. For it is true, as every pastor knows, and I see several of my brethren here tonight, that every pastor who goes about among people, and people within and without the church, is aware of the fact that it is hard to find a family, an American family anyway, or one long resident here, without a Bible in the house. . . .[5]

By October 1914, the World War, so ferverently expected by speakers at the prophetic conference in February, was well under way. Scofield noted this as he neared the conclusion of his message:

> A brother linked his arm in mine one day as I was leaving a meeting, and said, "Oh, you poor pessimist!" And I said, "Don't call me that!" The Bible is the most optimistic Book on earth; it absolutely refuses to hang its head, or to let the shine out of its eyes. It sees the chasm into which this world is plunging, and we can almost hear the echo of the guns over yonder, but the Bible looks straight across that chasm, and sees earth's golden age; sees the shining faces of the redeemed; sees the earth filled with "the knowledge of Jehovah, as the waters cover the sea"; sees humanity brought to its highest possible blessing and its highest possible capacity; sees God vindicated, after all the ages, during which the wickedness of man has drenched this earth with blood and tears, sees that all the time it was disobedience and sin; and sees at last God, not only vindicated, but God happy in the redeemed. Oh, this is the Book!"[6]

Unfortunately for Scofield, we are quite into the chasm, 70 years later. Consistent with his view (the falling Church Syndrome), he sees no blessing or prosperity for the church, but looks only to a future age for others.

In his concluding paragraph, he mentions his idea of the role of the school and the substance of his prayers for it:

> Well, now, I am going to tell you something about the Philadelphia School of the Bible; let me put it into a word. A few of us want to help. We want to help the Christian life and service of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania; we want to help every pastor in this city; we want to take some of his bright young men and young women and train them for more efficient work; and we want these, thus trained, to go where God may need them, where the need is great; and we want to teach this Book after the spirit and in the method that I have been speaking about here tonight;

> and we want you all to help. Pray—and give us some money, if the Lord so lead you, but pray anyway. I can tell you truthfully I have *no* ambition to serve; there is nothing I want from you but your love and prayers; and I do want to feel that somehow all of us are working here—we Christians in Philadelphia—and if this is our brotherly attitude, if this is our real heart longing, we shall see great things, if the Lord tarry.[7]

Now it happened that another Bible teacher, William Rugh, had a similar vision for Philadelphia. At virtually the same time, Rugh established the Bible Institute of Pennsylvania. It duplicated Scofield's school in every area of belief, doctrine and eschatology. While there was no apparent friction between the two schools at the official or executive level, it seems likely that financial and prayer support was diluted for many years.[8] The merger of the two into the Philadelphia College of the Bible in the years following World War II was a wise move.

Scofield appears to have commuted from his home in Douglaston to Philadelphia. Clarence E. Mason, long-time dean of the school, described Scofield's role to BeVier as "front-man."[9] The actual head was William L. Pettengill, who oversaw the day to day running of the institute. Scofield served as president until 1918 when his health forced him to resign.

In 1915, Scofield actually started his agreed writing for *The Sunday School Times*. His Bible Correspondence Course was taken over by Moody Press, a part of Moody Bible Institute, Chicago. The course remains an integral part of Moody's ministry today.[10]

That year also saw the publication of another collection of messages. *The New Life in Christ Jesus* was issued by the Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago. In a note "To The Reader," Scofield said:

> All of the matter composing this book was preached to my congregations in my two pastorates at Dallas, Texas, and Northfield, Massachusetts, and all save the first in the "Dallas News." These, reprinted in "The Christian Worker's Magazine", awoke a desire which seemed to be unusually widespread that these teachings concerning the New Life in Christ Jesus might be collected into a book. This, by arrangement with The Bible Institute Colportage Association, has now been done.
>
> The book is here and now committed to the care of Him who it seeks to exalt in the fervent prayer that through His grace it may show the way into happy, victorious, fruitful Christian living to many in bondage.
>
> C. I. Scofield
>
> Greyshingles
> Douglaston, N. Y.
> April 1915[11]

The dedication reads:

> To My Wife
>
> Who has been my untiring helper in whatever I have said or written for thirty-one blessed years. Always abiding in the ministries of a Christian

> home, she has left to me the thanks and prayers of those who have been blessed through our joint labours, content so only that Christ was exalted.[12]

One note shows up at several places in the book. (Selective quotation can be dangerous, however the point we make is consistent with Scofield's teaching elsewhere.) In the book there is a negative view of the Law. That negative view is so stated that the "weaker brother"[13] could readily conclude that moral standards are irrelevant to Christian experience. Typically, in the chapter "The Imparted Life":

> First, life by precept, by rule. There is a large truth here. The Bible is a great instruction in righteousness; a great revelation of the mind of God about human life. No inner light can take the place of the divine revelation. It is perfect ethically and also complete.
>
> But it has the fatal defect of furnishing no dynamic. "The law made nothing perfect." Precept gives a perfect rule of life, and by it life must always be tested, but precept carries no enablement. "The law *** was weak through the flesh." A chart does not carry us across the ocean, but it shows us where we are on the trackless deep, and where to go. The life by precept was tried under law and left the whole world of humanity in speechless guilt before God.[14]

The view of the Old Testament period is neither historically or theologically accurate, but is good Dispensational teaching.

In the chapter, "The Delivered Life," with the subheading, "The Process of Deliverance," he says:

> The believer is told that he is not under law, that is, a system of probation to see if he can work out a righteousness for himself, but under grace, that is, a system of divine inworking, which produces the very righteousness which the law required, but which man never achieved. The believer is assured that Christ has given to him eternal life, and that he shall never perish; that nothing is able to pluck him out of the omnipotent hand which holds him; that He who began a good work in him will perfect it till the day of Christ. As for his sins; they are blotted out, cast behind God's back, buried in the depths of the sea, forgiven and forgotten. And this is a necessary first work, for no man is really free who is under the bondage of fear.[15]

The view of the role of "law" is inaccurate. But implicit in the passage is a lurking antinomianism which justifies immorality.

Remember the Scofield who said, "We will not attempt in this age the work which God has reserved for the next,"[16] relegating social action to the future. Well, in this book, in the chapter, "The Larger Christian Life," he says:

> "The field is the world." Your field is the world. Keep your sympathies world wide. If your heart is in China or Africa or Central America, and with the work there, it is just the same as if you were there, wherever your body may happen to be.[17]

In 1915, he possibly could have avoided conflict between the two positions. But today, we find that the careful following of his first axiom "We will

not attempt . . ." has resulted in conditions which make difficult carrying out the second.

A British writer has noted:

> . . . Jewish appreciation of the sumptuous and the grandiose goes back to long before the splendours of Solomon's Temple, of the description of the Tabernacle, *Exodus* XXXV-XXXIX.[18]

Scofield's vision must have been somewhat similar. He is enthralled by the grandiose in Solomon's Temple and the Tabernacle of Moses, overlooking the Christian significance of the Tabernacle of David. In a chapter, "The Consecration," he uses the Ark in the Tabernacle of Moses and Solomon's Temple to show Christian consecration. For instance, speaking of the role of the priests, he says:

> . . . They went out. They did not remain to share the holy of holies with Jehovah. And you observe, it was "when the priests were come out of the holy place, the cloud filled the house of the Lord." I am well persuaded that the cloud would never have filled the house if the priests had remained within. They went out.[19]

The Christian relationship is much better illustrated by the visible Shekinah presence, open to all the Tabernacle of David.[20]

At one point, Scofield took a position which may have cleared up something which had been a bit garbled in reports of Moody's activities. Moody had been quite impressed with Professor Henry Drummond of Edinburgh for his Christian stand. However, it became apparent that Drummond (not related to the Banker of Albury) was an evolutionist of rather firm convictions. Careful review suggests that Moody's support was something less enthusiastic than reported and that Moody dropped him as he realized the "scientific" views involved. But circulated reports gave Drummond quite a boost among Fundamentalists. Scofield sought to correct this, for which we commend him:

> Witness the importation by professed Christians of Henry Drummond to lecture upon the "Ascent of Man" while they know that their Bibles give one long testimony to the descent of man. Never perhaps in all the history of the church was there such a turning of the back upon the altar of God and the temple of God to worship nature, as now, and never were these things doing such serious harm. To millions of professed Christians Drummond and Darwin are more authoritative than Moses.[21]

At this point, Scofield is sound, sensible and orthodox.

During 1915, Scofield joined with a number of other residents of Douglaston in organizing The Community Church of Douglaston. The first service was held May 2, 1915, in the Douglas Manor Inn. The group leased a store on Main Street for services, looking toward a future permanent edifice. Scofield and the Rev. John Baumeister officiated at the first Lord's Supper celebrated by the church on October

31, 1915. In November, Scofield agreed to preach regularly on Sunday mornings. The first social event of the church was a reception honoring Cyrus and Hettie (Dr. and Mrs.) Scofield held on February 9, 1916.[22]

Early in 1916, Marie Helene made a trip from Atchison to visit her father. The situation at "Greyshingles" during that visit was not one provided for in either Victorian or Fundamentalist etiquette. Apparently the whole thing came off with decorum. No comments have come down to us.

With the passing of the year 1916, someone (or some people) in the Dispensational leadership felt that Scofield should be honored by a testimonial dinner. Arrangements were made to hold the affair on October 26, 1916, at the Collegiate Reformed Church, New York, located at Fifth Avenue and 26th Street.[23] Remarkably, few reports of the affair have come down to us. Evidence suggests that Dr. James M. Gray was the instigator of the affair and was the principal speaker.

Testimonies were collected from many people who had known and worked with Scofield. The letters have been preserved in the Scofield Memorial Church, Dallas, but have not been available for inspection and research since the fire in 1976 which destroyed the old sanctuary.[24] William Nason of the church in Dallas collected testimonials from that area and forwarded them to Gray. BeVier, who examined the collection at the former building of the Scofield Church, noted one from the Baptist preacher, Rev. George W. Truett:

> He is easily one of the first preachers of his generation. But momentous as has been his work as a preacher, his greatest work, probably, has been in inspiring the multitudes to study God's Word. . . . His Reference Bible is a monumental achievement.[25]

Truett was of that school of Southern Baptist preachers heavier in oratorical preaching than in theological insight. The statement is characteristic.

The affair appears to have been ignored by much of the secular press. But strangely enough we have not found any place where it was noted in the religious or Fundamental press. And it does not appear that the promoters of the affair made any independent effort to circulate the proceedings on their own. We have not found a pamphlet in any Evangelical library consulted. Five years later, Dr. James M. Gray published his speech in *Moody Bible Institute Monthly* in lieu of an obituary for Scofield.

Gray started with an anecdote, no doubt designed to provoke laughter from the audience and set the mood of the affair:

> In speaking to a lady of the honor which had come to me—a friend of Dr. Scofield as well as myself—she asked if he would be present on the occasion? And when I answered, "Yes," she exclaimed, in some dismay, I thought, "What will you ever do, you'll *have* to praise him?"[26]

1916 was long before the days of Helen Hokanson, so we must assume that the lady in question expressed her feelings sincerely. But what did she mean?

The story of Scofield of being raised in the South was again accepted and promoted:

> Some of you who know and love him well will recall that smile and recognize that characteristic—part of his inheritance from the poetic and sunny South where hurry is not a virtue.[26]

The Southern upbringing is not confirmed by data already presented. The "transparency" incident in St. Louis was related:

> . . . It is on record also that after his conversion he once paraded with a banner advertising a gospel meeting, and although he had served as the United States district attorney, for by profession he was a lawyer, yet with the courage of his convictions, he marched up and down the street where many lawyers were located who had been his professional associates.[27]

But official records establish that Scofield, not being professionally established in St. Louis, would not have had professional associates.

Gray, referring to Scofield's time in The War Between The States, said: "He had fought with Lee," obviously an attempt to puff Scofield, who may never have seen Lee. The Northfield period was referred to:

> On Dr. Scofield's work in Northfield, Mass., there is not time adequately to dwell. But everybody knows it could not have been confined to the pastorate of a country church. What an opportunity was opened there through the hundreds of young lives coming and going every year in the Northfield Seminary for girls, and the Mt. Hermon School for boys. How many of these, now influential men and women throughout the world, have daily cause to thank God for his enlightened ministry![28]

This may have been the time when the story that Scofield had official connection with the Preparatory Schools got started. If so, Gray was an expert in semantics. The story was told so that those who were to accept the school connection had something, while the Northfield alumni who might have been in the audience thought Gray was sticking to the facts.

Of course, *The Scofield Reference Bible* and Scofield's role was mentioned. This, in fact, may have been a major purpose of the "winging." Gray said:

> This is Dr Scofield's richest gift. He knows how to read the Word of God and give the sense, and cause the people to understand the reading. He never writes or speaks in a haze. As was said of another, "No trace of indeterminateness can be found in any of his discussions on any subject." His insight pierces the intricacies.
>
> A Christian father, himself charmed by the Scofield Reference Bible, was pleased to see his young sons take it up night after night, because

> they said, "It was so easy to find out things." Thank God for a Bible expositer that can command the interest of children.[29]

Even though we find no publication of the speech before 1921, we found these identical words, from this part of Gray's speech in the original publication of Trumbull's sketch of Scofield which came out in 1919.

BeVier, who saw the collected testimonials, commented that no testimonials were received from people who had known him in Kansas.[30] But, as BeVier himself noted, those who knew him in Kansas could only know of him as he lived before 1879. The statement smacks a bit of naivete as those who knew the Kansas Scofield would not have appreciated the whole affair and further would have made comments utterly out of keeping with the ones read that evening.

Viewed from this perspective, the whole affair seems a bit too fulsome with praise, and more than a bit tawdry.

CHAPTER 34 NOTES

1. Ernest Sandeen, *The Roots of Fundamentalism,* p. 241.
2. *Ibid.,* pp. 241, 242.
3. BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 87.
4. *Ibid.,* p. 87.
5. C. I. Scofield, *The Spirit and Method of Bible Study,* reproduced in a Silver Anniversary Momento by the Philadelphia School of the Bible, Philadelphia, 1939, p. 3.
6. *Ibid.,* p 12.
7. *Ibid.,* pp. 12, 13.
8. The writer attended the Bible Institute of Pennsylvania in the 1930's. We noted no friction at the official level, but did find jibes and taunts exchanged between students of the two schools while working together on part-time jobs. Accusations of "fanatic" and "compromiser" were those most usually tossed back and forth.
9. Letter, Clarence E. Mason to William BeVier, Feb. 10, 1960, cited by BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 88.
10. *Scofield Bible Correspondence Course* (Chicago, Moody Bible Institute). In a letter to the writer, dated Sept. 5, 1979, Paul D. Weiland noted that the course was then set up in six volumes; cost $115.00. The student is given four years to complete the course. With concentrated study it can be completed in two years. Up to 1979, 54,590 students had enrolled. The 1978 enrollment was 2,800.
11. C. I. Scofield, *The New Life in Jesus Christ,* BICA, Chicago, 1915, on unnumbered page which by location would be page 7.
12. *Ibid.,* unnumbered page, located as page 5.
13. See Paul in Romans 14:21 and I Corinthians 8:13.
14. Scofield, *op. cit.,* p. 30.
15. *Ibid.,* p. 49.
16. Scofield, *Addresses on Prophecy,* p. 27.
17. Scofield, *The New Life,* p. 66.
18. C. Hamilton Ellis, *The London, Brighton and South Coast Railway,* Ian Allen, Ltd., London, 1960, p. 171.
19. Scofield, *op. cit.,* p. 92.
20. See our comments on The Tabernacle of David and the writing of George Smith in chapter 32.
21. Scofield, *op. cit.,* p. 121.

22. Letter to the writer from Rev. John H. Meyor, present pastor of the church.
23. The church is presently the Marble Collegiate Church, base of Norman Vincent Peale.
24. BeVier, *op. cit.*, p. 89.
25. *Ibid.*
26. James M. Gray, "Testimonial to Rev. C. I. Scofield, D.D., "*Moody Bible Institute Monthly,* September 1921, p. 550.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 551.
28. *Ibid.*
29. *Ibid.*, p. 552.
30. BeVier, *op. cit.*, pp. 89, 90.

CHAPTER 35

A Mix-up in Dates

> *"So teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom."*
>
> Psalm 90:12

In the previous chapter, we noted that Scofield was officially pastor of the fledgling church in Douglaston. There is every indication that he was also filling numerous speaking engagements elsewhere, a practice noted as far back as the 1880's. To protect the local responsibility, in November 1916, Trevor P. Mordecai, a Princeton Seminary student became part-time student supply pastor. Mordecai resigned early in 1917. Rev. Lloyd G. David was engaged to preach Sunday mornings in Scofield's absence.[1]

But we must remember that by 1916, Scofield was 73 years old. With a physical state not always top notch, he may not have been able to really carry the load of his various responsibilities. His commitment to *The Sunday School Times;* his speaking engagements; his work at the Philadelphia School of the Bible, all had to be paced according to his health.

Besides all this, during 1916 and 1917, someone was working with Oxford University Press on a revision of the Scofield Reference Bible. We have not been blessed with details of the actual revision process as we were with the original edition of 1909. The matter is complicated by the almost complete disappearance of the 1909 original edition, making detailed comparison difficult. (Our own Scofield Bible is a printing of the 1917 edition, the most common, most widely circulated issue.)

Possibly the study at "Greyshingles" and the Oxford University Press office were the scenes of most of the revising work. Scofield's part could have been fitted in between trips to Philadelphia and speaking engagements in other cities. The fact that a revision could even be contemplated less than eight years after the original, highlights the essential lack of integrity of the "Reference Bible" idea. The Word of God is eternal. It stands by itself, and as the Lord Himself stated near the close of the record:

> For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book *(Rev. 22.:18)*.

In the light of that statement, the concept of the Scofield Reference Bible (and those of its several successors) skates on very, very thin ice. This is especially so when thousands of less sophisticated users fail to

distinguish between the sacred text and the words of fallible man, when they are placed right together.

Comment on the Word and explanation of its teaching is not to be criticized, per se: it is entirely and absolutely necessary. But no real commentator is likely to be completely and finally satisfied with any statement. If he is developing spiritually, his views will develop. Even the greatest commentator will want to say something a little differently the next time. Thus to link the comments of fallible men, good or bad, with the sacred Word is of questionable integrity. None of this bothered Scofield in the least. And we will see that four years later in the last months of his life, he was contemplating yet another revision, the idea being halted only by his death.

The most notable change made in the 1917 edition of Scofield's work was the placing of a date on each page of text. The date was an interpretation of the chronology which Bishop Ussher had worked out in 1650-1654.[2] The good bishop may have been sincere and devout, but his scholarship was limited by the resources available in his own time. His work by 1917 had been largely supplanted in the minds of even conservative scholars. (It is still more realistic than anything worked out by Leakey, however.)

Scofield was not only unconcerned about the proper value of Ussher, but in both the 1917 edition of the Bible and other writings of the same period, he utilized and praised a very different Biblical chronology. The conflict he created passed unnoticed until Oswald Allis wrote in 1945.[3] In the intervening years, the Ussher dates were accepted as just as inspired as the Scofield notes by thousands of Scofield Reference Bible users.

When he wrote for *The Sunday School Times* in 1916, Scofield had opted for the Chronology of Anstey. (1913). Speaking of the problems of the 70 Weeks *(Daniel 9:25)* he said:

> Indeed, certain divisions of the time are distinctly announced. There is, first, a period of seven sevens 49 years during which Jerusalem is to be rebuilt, and this was fulfilled as we are told by Ezra and Nehemiah. Secondly, there is to be a period of sixty-two sevens = 434 years "unto the Messiah" who is to be "cut-off." And this also was exactly fulfilled according to Biblical chronology. Whatever confusion has existed at that point has been due to following Ptolemaic instead of the Biblical chronology, as Anstey in his "Romance of Biblical Chronology" (Association Press, New York City) has shown.[4]

When Oswald Allis compared that statement of Scofield, the 1917 notes and the dated pages, he found discrepancies. Note:

> In the notes on this prophecy in *RB* we meet one of the most remarkable phenomena in this *Reference Bible.* In *What Do the Prophets Say?,* which appeared serially in 1916 and in book-form in 1918, Scofield

> asserts emphatically that the prophecy of 70 weeks commences with the decree of Cyrus in 538 B.C. (pp. 142ff.); and he accepts Anstey's solution of the difficulty raised by this interpretation, viz., that the Ptolemaic chronology for the Persian period is *82 years too long*. Yet the notes on Dan. ix. 24-27 are exactly the same in the 1917 edition of *RB* as in the first edition where the 70 weeks are described as beginning with the decree of Artaxerxes. It is hard to reconcile these facts with the claim that the edition of 1917 represented an at all careful revision of the original edition. Somewhere between 1909 and 1917 Scofield evidently decided to print the Ussher chronology in the margin of the new edition. Somewhere between 1913 and 1916 he accepted, certainly in some important features, Anstey's system of chronology *(The Romance of Bible Chronology* appeared in 1913), which required a radical revision of the Ussher chronology. Yet not attempt is made to harmonize these differences, and the fact of their existence is not even referred to in *RB*. This is singular to say the least!"[5]

Not only singular, but a rather clear indication that the scholarship of The Scofield Reference Bible is less than excellent. But since Allis' comments, published in 1945, 28 years after the 1917 edition, were the first time the discrepancy was noted, we may properly wonder how much scholarly capability was present or used among the "Fighting Fundamentalist" camp in the 1920's and 1930's.

Allis' critiques help to measure Scofield's work:

> . . . it is not clear from the notes in *RB* whether he accepted the claim that the triumphal entry formed the concluding event of the 69th week. He seems to have deprecated the attempt to be very exact in dealing with the chronological data, pointing out that prophecy is "so indeterminate as to give no satisfaction to mere curiosity." This looks a little like a slur on Anderson's mathematical calculation. But the words "mere curiosity" would certainly not apply to Anderson. Apparently, Scofield was uncertain as to the details of interpretation. On several points, however, he was quite specific. According to the notes in *RB* the beginning of the period of the 70 weeks is to be counted from Artaxerxes' degree which was issued "between 454 and 444 B.C."; and in the first 7 weeks (49 years) "Jerusalem was to be rebuilt in "troublous times". This was fulfilled, as Ezra and Nehemiah record." 483 years (69 weeks) counted from 450 B.C. would extend to approximately 33 A.D. (Ussher's date for the crucifixion). But Scofield merely says that they bring us "to the time of Christ." On the two points, which are characteristic of the Dispensational interpretation he is quite explicit: the crucifixion comes after the 69th week, and the entire 70th week is postponed and still future.[6]

Further comments suggest that the Scofield Bibles Notes are not merely inadequate, but actually carelessly put together:

> How full his "chronological data" correspond with Ussher's chronology is indicated by the fact that the marginal dates given in the Book of Esther (B.C. 521-509) identify Ahasuerus with Darius Hystapis (cf. marginal dates of Haggai and Zechariah). Yet in the margin of Ezra iv.6 it is positively stated that Ahasuerus was Xerxes. In the case of the Epistle

> of James, Scofield has given Ussher's date (A.D. 60), but has expressed complete agreement with Weston's opinion that James was "the first Epistle to Christians," which would date it at or before A.D. 54 (cf. *RB*, p. 1267). On the other hand, in the case of Obadiah he changed Ussher's date (B.C. 587) to B.C. 887 a date which readers unfamiliar with the reasons for the divergence might easily regard as a misprint. Most remarkable of all, about the time when the decision was made to place the Ussher chronology in the margin of *RB*, Scofield adopted one of the most radical of the modifications of that chronology proposed by Anstey. Such being the case, it would have avoided confusion and misunderstanding had he simply stated that, for the sake of convenience, he was restoring the Ussher chronology in the margin of the text and at the same time pointed out in what respects he deemed it unreliable and in need of correction. This would not only have removed the difficulties just mentioned, it would also have relieved Scofield of direct responsibility for such dates as B.C. 1520 for Job, 1014 for the Song of Songs, 977 for Ecclesiastes, dates which at best can only be approximate, but give the appearance of an accurate knowledge which no one can justly claim to possess.[7]

One of Scofield's most loyal supporters has found another "goof." Pastor Cornelius Stam noted:

> In 1917 the introduction to "The Jewish-Christian Epistles" indicates emphatically that Paul did *not* write the Epistle to the Hebrews, while the introduction to the epistle itself states that "the reference in II Pet. 3:15 seems conclusive that Paul was the writer"! That was a bad one![8]

In his work, Oswald Allis noted material on 85 pages which he considered unscriptural.[9] Jesse Hodges' study refers to 15 pages where he finds material out of line. (His 15 pages differ from the 85 noted by Allis.)[10] Since only 565 pages of the Scofield tome really have comment, and two commentators find 100 pages open to criticism, what is the value of his work?

In this light, the gushing praise heaped on Scofield's work by Dr. James M. Gray seems a bit forced:

> This is Dr. Scofield's richest gift. He knows how to read the Word of God and give the sense, and cause the people to understand the reading. He never writes or speaks in a haze. As was said of another, "No trace of indeterminateness can be found in any of his discussions on any subject." His insight pierces in intricacies.[11]

The evaluation of Charles G. Trumbull in his "biography" seems worse than a public relations puff. He was to say of the work: "God-planned, God-guided, God-illuminated and God-energized work."[12]

Scofield and his followers have always been quick to quote II Tim. 2:15: "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the Word of Truth." But can the careless handling we have just cited be the work of one who "needeth not to be ashamed"? Is the Dispensational method "rightly dividing the Word of Truth"?

While Scofield was working with Oxford University Press on the revision, President Wilson was leading the country into World War I. Outside of Scofield's prophetic interest and the difficulty which Hettie, along with other housewives had in purchasing sugar, the conflict does not appear to have particularly touched the Scofield household in Douglaston. Noel was 29 years old when Wilson asked Congress for the declaration of war. Many men of that age, single and married, were taken into the armed forces, some giving their lives. No record of military service by Noel Scofield has been located at the time of writing.[13]

On August 19, 1917, Scofield reached the age of 74. Even the limited personal references in published materials suggest that his pace of activity was slowing down, as appropriate to his years. Another indication of the passing of time was the death of one who had shared the early years of life with him. His sister Laura died on November 8, 1917. Her obituary, from the *St. Louis Globe-Democrat* for Nov. 9, 1917, is:

> Mrs. Laura S. Eames Dies
>
> Mrs. Laura Scofield Eames, wife of the late Dr. W. H. Eames, died yesterday at her residence, 316 North Newstead Avenue, after a short illness. She is the mother of the late William S. Eames, architect, and is survived by one son, Col. H. E. Eames, four daughters, eight grandchildren and eight great-grandchildren. The funeral will take place Saturday afternoon at 2:30 from St. George's Chapel.[14]

It is interesting that the Eames did not think that a surviving brother (uncle) of world-wide fame should be listed as a survivor. The relation of Scofield and his sisters after he entered his ministerial role is not at all clear. They evidently did not view him in the same manner that he was viewed by the Fundamentalist community. They may have been somewhat ambivalent about things in Cyrus' life which would have horrified the Fundamentalists. There is no report of anyone from Douglaston attending the service at St. George Chapel.

One of the interesting things about modern religious prophecy is the extent to which "prophecy buffs" have made their prophecies conform with the events which the chancelleries of the major powers have brought to pass. Most religious prophets did their best to prepare followers for August 1914 and what followed. Scofield during the war kept in close touch with events on the world scene, filtering everything according to the Dispensational view of Matthew 24. Referring to General Allenby's entry into Jerusalem on December 11, 1917, he wrote to Charles H. Trumbull: "Now for the first time, we have real a prophetic sign."[15] His statement, of course, overlooks Matthew 16:4 which suggests that no signs are to be given. The value of the "sign" mentioned by Scofield can be measured by the fact that a very similar statement was made nearly 50 years later when the modern Israelis entered the old city of

Jerusalem at the end of the Six-Day War. Quite simply, events have not moved according to the scheme which the Dispensationalists have drawn up from Daniel 9:25, 26.

A further indication of Scofield's advancing age was the fact that he began the then rather uncommon practice of spending the winters in Florida to escape the rigors of northern winters. For his winter abode, he chose Crescent City. Located in Putnam County, on Crescent Lake, Crescent City is about 20 miles south of Palatka. It would appear that Scofield stayed in either a hotel or a rented house for the first several winters.[16]

In March 1918, the Central American Mission recognized its founder and held its Executive Committee meeting at Crescent City. It was the last meeting of the mission which Scofield attended.

Scofield returned to Douglaston before Easter (March 31 that year). Soon after he was taken ill, the illness, as always, unspecified. Before illness struck, he was able to write the dedication and foreword to a collection of messages entitled *What Do The Prophets Say?* They had appeared during 1916 in *The Sunday School Times,* which published them in book form. One of those messages was referred to earlier in the chapter. The dedication read:

> To
> My Friend
> ALWYN BALL, JUNIOR
> whose generous fellowship and constant affection have done so much to make possible such work as I have, by God's grace, been enabled to do, I dedicate this book as a token of gratitude.
>
> C. I. Scofield
>
> Easter, 1918
> Greyshingles,
> Douglaston, Long Island, N.Y.[18]

Ball was one of the original contributors to the cost of the Bible project. The dedication is an indication that Scofield for years had been a plaything of men of considerable wealth who could finance special activities or hobbies. Through their "generosity," ideas were promoted and publicized which otherwise would have had little chance of wide acceptance. Full details of Scofield's support will probably never be known. But the overt supporters were always men on the fringes of the world of finance.

The foreword was so completely contemporary as to make it meaningless to those who have lived through World War II and the last half of the 20th Century.

> FOREWORD
>
> That the human race is in a supreme crisis is obvious to the dullest intelligence. Nothing like it has ever marked the long life of humanity on the earth. It is impossible to restrain the effort to find the meaning of it all. No one is really either satisfied with or convinced by the easy

> solutions proposed by a shallow optimism. For thirty years these prophets of peace without righteousness have assured us that great and serious wars were ended forever; and yet we are in the greatest and most serious of all wars. *What does it all mean?*
>
> The Christian believes that somehow, somewhere, the answer is in the writings of the prophets-writings authenticated by Jesus Christ (Luke 16:31, 24:27,44), and by hundreds of literal fulfilments. But these writings, plain and explicit in themselves, have been forced into meanings utterly foreign to the language used, in the effort to make them apply to the Church instead of to Israel; or have been the ready resort of unscholarly fanatics.
>
> Surely it is timely that a sane and reasonable interpretation of those writings should be found. This book is a sincere effort to present such an interpretation, after thirty-five years of earnest study.
>
> C. I. Scofield
>
> Greyshingles, Douglaston, L.I.
> Easter, 1918.

The foreward brings out another mix-up in dates. The "thirty-five years of earnest study" takes us back to early 1883. According to statements made about events of that fall, there were supposed to have been two years of "earnest study" running back to 1881 (but we have serious doubts about all stories of that period). Possibly 35 was selected as a round number. But it may be no more accurate than anything else reported by and about Scofield.

The articles or messages actually placed between covers are: Does The Bible Throw Light On This War?, The Prophet, The Ethical Message, The Messiah, The Vision Of The Kingdom, The Prophetic Ministry of Jesus Christ, The Prophetic Message of The Acts, Prophecy In The Epistles, The Revelation, The Last Seven Years Of The Age, and Earth's Golden Age. Below the list of subjects, Scofield placed this note:

> As a convenience to the reader, almost every passage of Scripture referred to throughout this book is given, in whole or in part, in the footnotes. And the reader will find that, for his further convenience, the same Scripture material is repeated over and over again in these footnotes, so that he may have constantly before him, without having to turn pages or look up references in his Bible, the Word of God on which this book is based.
>
> A Scripture Index at the end of the book will enable one to find the location of every Scripture passage here discussed; the Topical Index locates many details of prophecy on which God's Word throws light.[19]

This, of course, succeeded in inflating the size of the book. Eight pages are nothing but Scripture. Many have but a few lines of Scofield's text. The result is that a typical reader with a Scofield Bible and a copy of *What Do The Prophets Say?* would get the feeling that there was a completely inseparable bond between the Holy Writ and the Tennessean-from-Michigan. In its own little way, the book helped place Scofield's head in the halo which he now wears in so many Dispensational minds.

As we consider this bit of Scofield's writing, it would be well to keep in mind the statement of Brethren writer, F. Roy Coad:

> It is here useful to notice one interesting fact. Almost invariably interpretation has been vitiated by the reluctance or incapacity of commentaters to envision their own age as other than the end time. As a consequence beliefs are in a constant state of revision and restatement.[20]

The messages in this work were written by the Scofield who in 1914 claimed that he rather expected the Rapture to preclude the possibility of physical death.[21] The whole sense of the messages are that the events of World War I place the church and the world just about at the end of Revelation 3 and approaching the beginning of Revelation 4 as Dispensationally interpreted. As F. Roy Coad said, this belief has required restatement. Dare we say that the very need for restatement suggests that somehow the hand of the Holy Spirit is missing from such interpretation?

If, because of its obsolescence, we are "beating a dead horse" in commenting on it, we do so in order to highlight the inadequacy of Scofield's teaching. Hopefully our analysis will encourage some to remove the halo which he now wears. And since today prophetic teachers in pulpit, pamphlet and television are using similar methods, revised as noted by Coad, we hope that readers will be better able to measure that sort of teaching.

In his first chapter, "Does The Bible Throw Light on The War?", Scofield starts from the usual inaccurate prophetic interpretation of the Image of Daniel 2. He proceeded to relate the war to an imminent and dismal end for the age:

> It may, however, be helpful to present in outline the prophetic testimony concerning the end-time of Gentile rule over the earth, taking up throughout this book the proof in detail.
>
> 1. The age ends in catastrophe. No prophetic voice describes the end of the "times of the Gentiles" in the peaceful terms which uninspired forecasters in pulpits and newspapers have made familiar. Daniel says that the end "shall be with a flood"; and that "unto the end wars and desolations are determined". The Lord Jesus finds in the Biblical history of the flood, and of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, suited pictures of the end-time of the age. "As it was in the days of Noah." "As it was in the days of Lot." The significance is terrible [22]

All of which may be Darbyism and Scofieldism, but not guaranteed to accurately present the Lord's meaning. He continues the hopelessness:

> 2. So far as the prophetic Word has spoken there is not the least warrant for the expectation that the nations engaged in the present gigantic struggle will or can make a permanent peace. It is fondly dreamed that out of all the suffering and carnage and destruction of this war will be born such a hatred of war as will bring to pass a federation of the

> nations—The United States of the World—in which will exist but one army, and that an international police, rather than an army.
>
> For once there is some correspondence between a popular dream and the prophetic Word. For that word certainly points to a federated world-empire in the end-time of the age. . . .[23]

Here again note the remarkably close correspondence between what a prophetic teacher said and what groups and interests like the Carnegie Peace Foundation, the Elites, have wanted for the rest of mankind. Who financed Scofield? Today the prophecy crowd looks to the European Common Market to be the basis of the "End-Time Federation." This writer has worked, socialized and even worshipped with people of the Common Market staff. Such contact confirms the feeling that this association in prophetic minds is somewhat out of reality.

Continuing, Scofield admits that some sort of peace is possible, but he refuses to let down on his fervent hope for doom and suffering:

> It is, of course, possible, nay, probable that some temporary truce may end, or suspend for a time, the present world-war, for ten kingdoms will exist at the end-time in the territory once ruled over by Rome. . . .[24]

We have no evidence that Scofield was gleeful about the prospect, but he surely presses his point.

In chapter 2, "The Prophet," we note an interesting comment on the matter of righteousness:

> The primary ministry of the prophets, therefore, was patriotic and intensely ethical. They say peace for Israel only through righteousness (Isa. 32:17, for example). Nothing else would answer. On that high condition and no other would Jehovah throw about the land which he had given to his people the invisible wall of his protection; on that condition and no other should the people be at peace among themselves; on that condition and no other might the individual Israelite be at peace in his own soul. In no part of the Scriptures does the ethical demand rise to greater heights. The Sermon on the Mount is but the ethical teaching of the prophets lifted to its highest potency.[25]

In the last line quoted, he was following the Dispensational practice of downgrading the Sermon on the Mount in the eyes of the church. And we see a suggestion in Scofield's eyes, that only Israel can really be acceptable to the Holy One.

"The Messiah" is the title of chapter 4. Here again, Scofield allows only gloom and failure for the church age. He looks only beyond, saying: "Amos also testifies to the exaltation of Messiah at his second advent:" (he has no meaning for the passage before that):

> "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old" (Amos 9:11). And here, as in the prophecy of Zechariah, there is no possibility of giving the words figurative inter-

> pretation, for the passage is quoted in the New Testament and applied to the return of the Lord (Acts 15:13–18).[20]

We have noted and will note again that any reasonable interpretation of the "Tabernacle of David" is not literal, but rather an institution raised by a tentmaker endued with power from on high. And that tent though a bit tattered, is a living organism today. Whether Scofield's failure to note the proper interpretation arose from ignorance or obfuscation, we have no knowledge. But such failure has hurt church and church member.

In Message V, "The Vision of The Kingdom," Scofield expounds a Dispensational position which is more than demeaning of the power of Our Lord and Saviour:

> And even in the millennial kingdom on earth, when Christ is reigning with a rod of iron, not all men will be His willing subjects. There cannot in that age be any "unbelievers" on earth, for Christ will be manifested in glory, and unbelief therefore will be impossible. But there will be those who, hating God, sullenly obey Christ the King.[27]

That the Lord, physically present on the Earth (a point not firmly supported in Scripture), cannot bring all men to acknowledgement of Him suggests that Scofield has no real vision of the power and majesty of the Lord.

We could go on and on in the analysis of the volume, but the excerpts we have given suggest that the scholarshp and the devotion of Scofield leave something to be desired. In the matter of the chronology in both the message and the revised notes, we submit that the claim of scholarship for Scofield's work is far from correct. He put out works which were designed to promote particular views which were desired by the group who looked to him as their figurehead. But who should this be so strange? Our study has indicated that Scofield had neither the background, the training, nor the time for real scholarship.

In May, Scofield was taken ill, but by June he was able to make the trip to Ashuelot where he spent the summer. On Aug. 5, 1918, he wrote daughter Abigail, replying to a letter of hers. In addition to giving some particulars about the Florida residence, it discusses some family financial matters. The text is:

> Aug. 5/18
>
> My dearest Abbie:
>
> Don't think that I have forgotten the bungalow. I was taken ill in May & that left me in great weakness & I'm only now at my desk again. But I have at least one & I think two pen jobs which will be good for $500 each. One would raise us to $1200 & two to $1700. Would the latter amount suffice? It would here for living room, 2 bedrooms, bath, kitchen & small maid's room. A "Steel magnate" is building one like that in Florida which I am to have free use of while I live. Shall I send you a sketch of the Plan?

With cordial best wishes to Doctor, & love.

Father[28]

The wording of the letter gives a very strong impression that cash, not edification of the saints, motivated his writing.

In chapter 16, we noted that Abbie and Edward (Dr. Kellogg) had moved to California after Dr. Kellogg's health failed and he was forced to give up the practice of dentistry. Abbie's post at the San Luis Obispo Library was undoubedly a matter of financial necessity. From the first sentence of the letter, we gather that in previous correspondence, Abbie had suggested the possibility of financial assistance from her father, who was world-renowned and who had a considerable income from royalties on his writings.

The ailment of "Scofielditis" which he referred to in the 1909 letter to Helene would seem not to have been "cured" by 1918. The mystery of Scofield finances, first mentioned in the relation of the second St. Louis sojourn (chapter 12) remains just beyond satisfactory explanation. But as we near the end of his life, we have a glimmer. In connection with the settlement of Scofield's estate after his demise, a CPA noted the following royalty payments from the legers of Oxford University Press, American branch.[29] The years are fiscal, ending March 31 in each instance.)

1917	$9,975.79
1918	14,891.91
1919	13,541.80
1920	17,908.94
1921	20,028.09

(These figures should be multiplied many times to be comparable to the depreciated currency of the present inflation.)

Many authors with acclaim in the world at large did not do so well. (Edgar Rice Burroughs, Booth Tarkington and Gene Stratton Porter being notable exceptions.) There were royalties to Cyrus from other publishers as well. The rather generous figure, especially the one for fiscal 1918 makes one wonder about the continued delay on father's part in responding to Abigail's need.

In the last week of November 1918, a prophetic conference was held in New York City. The main sessions were in Carnegie Hall on West 57th Street (close to The Lotos Club). A. C. Gaebelein directed and planned the conference. Scofield was invited to speak, but he declined. He did attend one session and sat on the platform. Gaebelein later reported, "His feebleness was apparent to all."[30]

This was the conference where R. A. Torrey waxed rapturous over anarchy and upset:

> Autocracy is a dangerous thing; anarchy is a far more dangerous thing. But as I hear the low rumblings of the thunder of the coming

> storm, as I go over to the East Side of New York, as I go across the river in Chicago, as I walk the streets of Milwaukee, as I go down the Los Angeles streets and see the soap box orators of the I.W.W., my heart is not heavy, not a bit. When men's hearts are quaking for fear, says our Lord Jesus, look up, for your redemption draweth nigh. The Lord is coming.
>
> Oh, how those words ought to thrill our hearts. He is coming! Perhaps within a year, perhaps in a month, perhaps in a day, perhaps tonight. Would you be glad if right here now before another song is sung, or anything is done, there should burst suddenly upon this audience the voice of the archangel, the trump of God, the shout of command?[31]

Now this hardly sounds like the concern which the Lord expressed as He forecast suffering for Jerusalem. It is so lacking in human compassion. Yet, this is entirely in the milieu of the movement to which Scofield's name and fame is applied.

Trumbull reports that in January 1919, Scofield received a letter from France stating that he had been elected to membership in the Societe Academique d'Histoire Internationale, a part of the Academie Francaise (L'Institut de France). As reported, a medal of membership and a diploma came with the notification. The diploma read (as translated):

> International Academic History Society
> Founded in 1903
> Certified in conformity to the Law of
> 1 July 1901, NO. 154,142
> 50, Boulevard St. Jacques, 50 Paris
> Perpetual Honorary President
> Mr. Frederic Mistral
> Commander of the Legion of Honor
> Awards a Founding Member Diploma to
> Dr. Cyrus I. Scofield
> Paris, 6 February 1919
>
> The President
> Officer of the Legion of Honor
> Vicount de Faries
>
> Officer of the Secretary General
> of Public Instruction[32]

Whatever Scofield's actual reaction to the diploma was, neither he nor his associates thought it worthy of notice in the prestigious newspaper, *The New York Times*. The first public notice of the award appeared in the Palatka, Florida *NEWS*.[33] Palatka was, as noted, not far from Scofield's winter residence at Crescent City. The appearance of the story late in March 1919 coincided with Trumbull's visit which produced the work discussed in the next chapter. On April 3, The *Dallas Morning News,* owned by a member of First Church, picked up the story. It, of course, appeared in Trumbull's articles and book. After that, silence. And the present whereabouts of the medal is unknown.

It is not at either Dallas Seminary nor the present Scofield Memorial Church.

And there are several unresolved flaws in the story. Note that in the alleged text of the diploma, the French poet, Frederic Mistral (who had passed on in 1914), is identified as "Mr." That is just not the true writing of anyone connected with the Academie Francaise. We found no reference anywhere to the "Société Académique d'Histoire Internationale." All that the present staff of the Academy could tell us was that the Societe had gone out of existence in 1920. From a copy of the alleged diploma, they could give us no detail of the group, nor any clue as to why Scofield would be honored.[34] They noted that M. Mistral had no connection with the Academy.

Note that ever since the French Revolution, official and academic France has been committed to a philosophy today called "humanistic" and is and has been complete at variance with any ideas represented by Fundamental Christianity. The reports on the medal gave accurate highlights about the founding of the Academy, itself, by Cardinal Richelieu in 1635, but offered no reason why the Scofield Reference Bible fit in such company. The fact that the alleged medal went unnoticed after the original faint splash in 1919, makes us have very serious questions about the whole business. And our review of Scofield's magnum opus (note the title of this chapter) makes it unlikely that any scholar connected in any way with the Academy would have awarded anything to Scofield.

CHAPTER 35 NOTES

1. Letter to the writer from Rev. John D. Meyer, pastor of the church in the 1970's.
2. Originally published in *Annales Veteris et Novi Testamentum* 1650-1654. Ussher was a bishop in Ireland; was in England at the time of the Civil War. While never fully accepting the Puritan position, he was given a post by Cromwell. He never returned to Ireland. His chronology, while loyal to the Word, has been made obsolete by modern Bible-believing scholarship. It was sufficiently out-of-date in 1917 that Scofield should never have placed it in his new edition.
3. Allis' work was *Prophecy and The Church,* Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., 1945.
4. Scofield, What *Do The Prophets Say?,* The Sunday School Times Co., 1918, p. 142.
5. Allis, *op. cit.,* p. 308.
6. *Ibid.,* p. 307.
7. *Ibid.,* p. 268.
8. Cornelius R. Stam, The *New Scofield Reference Bible, An Appraisal,* The Berean Bible Society, Chicago, 1967, p. 8.
9. The writers count of the notes in the Allis work cited.
10. Noted in *Christ's Kingdom and Coming,* with an analysis of Dispensationalism, Eerdmanns, 1957.
11. James M. Gray, "A Tribute to Rev. C. I. Scofield," *Moody Bible Institute Monthly,* Sept. 1921, p. 552.
12. Trumbull, *op. cit.,* p. 114.

13. According to military records of the State of New York and the National Archives.
14. *St. Louis Globe-Democrat,* November 9, 1917. Supplied by the Missouri Historical Society.
15. Quoted by Charles G. Trumbull in *Prophecy's Light on Today,* Revell, New York, 1937, p. 67. Trumbull merely quotes the phrase, but gives no details of the circumstances. We do not know whether the letter has survived.
16. See Scofield's letter of August 5, 1918, quoted above. The steel magnate could have been one of the Mosher family of Dallas, whose role in the Mosher Steel Company and the Scofield Church have already been noted.
17. Luther Rees in *The Central American Bulletin, No.* 188, Sept. 15, 1921, p. 3.
18. Scofield, *What Do The Prophets Say?,* The Sunday School Times Co., Philadelphia, Pa., 1918, p. 5.
19. *Ibid.,* p. 7.
20. F. Roy Coad, *Prophetic Developments,* The Brethren Research Fellowship, Pinner, Middlesex, England, 1966, p. 10.
21. See report of the 1914 Conference in chapters 35 and 36.
22. Scofield, *op. cit.,* p. 15.
23. *Ibid.,* p. 18.
24. *Ibid.,* p. 19.
25. *Ibid.,* p. 23.
26. *Ibid.,* p. 49.
27. *Ibid.,* p. 56.
28. Original letter in possession of Mr. John H. Mize of Atchison, Kansas.
29. Data in the file of the Scofield estate, Surrogate's Office, Queens County, N. Y. See chapter 40.
30. A. C. Gaebelein, "The Story of the Scofield Reference Bible," *Moody Monthly,* January 1943, p. 65.
31. A. C. Gaebelein, editor, *Christ and Glory,* Publication Office, Our Hope. R. A.Torrey. *That Blessed Hope,* p. 33.
32. Trumbull, *op. cit.,* p. 105.
33. Copies of the Palatka, Florida *NEWS* for early 1919 are not extant and cannot be checked to confirm the report carried by the Dallas paper in April.
34. Letters from Bibliotheque d'L'Institut de France to the writer.

CHAPTER 36

"Paul and Timothy" or The Role of Charles G. Trumbull

"Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; rebuke, exhort with all long suffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine."

II Tim. 4:2,3a

A photograph of C. I. Scofield and Charles G. Trumbull, sitting and talking in the Florida sun at the Southfield Bible Conference in Crescent City, has been reproduced in several books. Informally titled "Paul and Timothy," it has created an implied association with Trumbull's visit to Scofield in 1919. The exact date of the photograph has not been established, but the feebleness which was reported during Scofield's appearance in Cargenie Hall in November 1918 is not apparent.

The "Paul and Timothy" allusion is heightened in the photograph because Trumbull, either actually or by careful posing, looks much younger than a man in his 40's. (Trumbull was in his 40's when he made the 1919 visit.) The photograph and caption create the impression that the two men had a relationship much like that which existed between the Apostle and Timothy, as noted in the two epistles.

Apparently the "steel magnate's" bungalow had been completed by the time that Scofield reached Crescent City in the winter of 1919, so Trumbull had a place to stay. His visit was for more than a few days as it had a definite purpose. Trumbull interviewed Scofield to gather material for a series of articles on Scofield's life and work which appeared in *The Sunday School Times* between May and September of that year

In 1920, Oxford University Press picked up the articles, and issued them in book form as *The Life Story of C. I. Scofield.* The book is the only attempt at biographical coverage of Fundamentalism's most popular figure, and remarkably the circulation of the book may have been quite limited. Copies are virtually unobtainable in the active market for used religious classics.

A study of what Trumbull accomplished during his visit to Crescent City provides another dimension for measuring man, men and movement. The various references "Trumbull, *op. cit.*" in this work must have already suggested that Trumbull's sketch of Scofield is a most

unusual venture in biography. Trumbull was probably the most competent religious journalist on the American scene in the first half of the 20th Century. He had spent his entire career, since his graduation from Yale in 1893, in religious journalism, combined with conference speaking and the writing of tracts and books.

The writing which came from the Trumbull visit to Crescent City in 1919 is quite different from the other writing which bears his name. *The Life Story of C. I. Scofield* (we have worked from the book, not the magazine articles) is peppered with inaccuracies. Our check shows more than 38 errors in the 130 pages which make up the book form of the story. Several can be explained by careless editing. Some may be due to interpretation as lengthy narratives were condensed to the space allotment of the articles. But there are evident problems in accounting for some of the shortcomings. There are a number of discrepancies for which the most ready explanation would be deliberate fabrication. They cannot be fitted into the category of an aging man's faulty memory. We do not accuse; fabrication is so utterly characteristic of Fundamental Christianity.

In November, Scofield had been noted as physically feeble, but even two years after the interview, visitors noted that his mind was clear. If he did have a clear mind and reasonable memory in early 1919, he must bear the responsibility for being inaccurate. If Trumbull was more interested in story than fact, his integrity must be placed on the line. Was the departure from fact a joint collaboration of Scofield and Trumbull? How much did the school leaders, the church officials, the evangelists know of the careless story-telling?

Inconsistencies in the Trumbull narration have been noted chapter by chapter. The reader, by now, may consider that his attempt was not serious or definitive biography. But there are certain discrepancies which deserve particular comment.

On page 25 (these references are to pages in the book) speaking of Scofield in the 1870's, Trumbull said: "He had, indeed, become very much dissatisfied with his own life; he was not living up to even his own ideals, unconverted man that he was."[1] In the light of the St. Louis Court records and the *Atchison Patriot,* Trumbull's statement is convenient judgment after the fact.

On page 30, Trumbull notes regarding Scofield's conversion: "But the facts have been given here as they actually occurred and as Dr. Scofield wants them known."[2] Passing over the propriety of the use of "Dr.," note from chapter 12 herein, that the "facts" Trumbull wrote down, apparently with Scofield's blessing, do not agree with the data in official public records. What Trumbull related may have been only what Scofield wanted known. Our investigation suggests that it departs substantially from unvarnished truth. In the previous line, Trumbull wrote:

> There have been all sorts of inaccurate and misleading stories of the conversion of Dr. Scofield, passing from mouth to mouth. Some of them have gained currency, and as he says, himself, he long ago gave up hope of correcting or denying them!

Sounds like "Paul and Timothy" were attempting to "stonewall." But apparently there were some who could not accept the Scofield story even when he was still alive.

The relation of the Civil War period in previous chapters speaks for itself. But we remain amazed that some Confederate veteran who also received the Cross of Honor failed to call Scofield or Trumbull on its proper significance.

Note that Trumbull and Scofield worked out a story of his life between 1866 and 1874 that left the impression of his being a bachelor even though that word was not used. The very careful use of language did not result from hasty note taking, nor were these the ramblings of an aged mind. The specific word bachelor was not used, but the treatment leaves an impression completely at variance with facts.

It is not now possible to determine whether Scofield or Trumbull or someone else originated the story of the alleged period of drunkenness. The value of a story of a victorious bout with demon rum has been noted.[4] George Marsden has noted the social significance of the interplay between Fundamentalism and "demon rum."[5]

Trumbull's claim of a two-year term as district attorney is not a simple mistake. Here again, it is not possible to ascertain whether Scofield had been using two years instead of six months or whether the time was selected during the "Paul and Timothy" session.

When the results of the interview reached publishable form, they included, as a "Confederate reminiscience," what we have referred to as the "Conkling Incident." From page 128 of the book, note:

> Another Confederate reminiscence which appeals to Dr. Scofield's sense of humor is in connection with a formal dinner that he attended, to which Senator Roscoe Conkling had been invited. The Senator failed to appear until quite late, and then came, in immaculate evening dress of course, to join the rest who had been expectantly waiting his arrival. "In his oracular and ponderous way" says Dr. Scofield, "the great statesman explained his delay: 'The senior Senator from Massachusetts (Sumner) has just been making his annual attempt to enact a law to abolish the distinction made by God Almighty between black and white.' "[6]

No doubt Scofield attended a dinner in Washington addressed by Conkling. But it did not take place during a period that would make it proper to be called a "Confederate reminiscence."

The flaws in the story cleared by Scofield and published by Trumbull are:

1. Roscoe Conkling (R-N.Y.) did not become senator until 1867—after the War. As suggested before, the dinner was probably in late June or July 1873 in the period covered by chapter 9.
2. If Scofield had been still in the Army of Northern Virginia, as Trumbull averred on his page 9, up to April 1865, he had *no* business being in the "enemy" capitol during the War, hence could not properly have attended a dinner in Washington at any time between 1862 and 1865.
3. There is no record of Scofield in the Army of Northern Virginia after September 1862, so if he were near Appomattox on April 9, 1865, as claimed in the Trumbull story, he must have been fulfilling some other role.
4. The references to being in Washington, placed under the heading "Confederate reminiscences" hint that between 1862 and 1865, he had a role that gave him facility in crossing the battle lines from side to side, almost at will, or as ordered by some "higher up." We know of but one possible role where this would have been possible.
5. The last sentence quote is interesting. Is it a hint at a position now called "racist"? But Conkling was associated with the liberals who had pushed the North into war. Was his "liberalism" only for political effect?

Trumbull's narrative at this point is, in relation to the rest of his text, extremely clumsy. Possibly Scofield had been "carried away" in "raconteuring" to Trumbull. Something may have been put down which was too "hot" for the Dispensational clientele in 1919. When Scofield checked the galleys, he saw something that had to be deleted. A clumsy rewrite thus may have been necessary. The rewrite, if it occurred, is so clumsy that it may hint at more than it covers. Fortunately for Scofield and Trumbull, Dispensationalists, lay and cleric, are rarely history buffs or Civil War buffs. The Dispensational thought pattern was insurance which meant no one saw that the story was brimming over with discrepancies.

Note further that Senator Conkling was the first prominent figure in the political life of our Republic to openly flaunt an adulterous relationship. Christian edification might well have suggested omitting mention of Conkling, entirely.

On his page 125, Trumbull said:

> Dr. Scofield loves all nature—not only men and women and children, but the whole created world, still so beautiful in spite of what Satan and sinners have done to mar God's work.[7]

Much of the truth of that statement is belied by his treatment, during their growing years, of Abigail and Marie Helene. There is firm evidence that during years when a growing family needs both parents, Cyrus was neglecting them financially and posing as a bachelor. He accepted without murmur the denial of visitation rights. Then, posing as a new benedict, wed to someone else, he continued to accept the legal bar until the rights became moot with the girls' legal majorities.

While Victorian attitudes still prevailed when both Abigail and Marie Helene were married, we must still question Cyrus' willingness to avoid being involved in either wedding. Even the letters we have referred to, sent to the girls, fail to support Trumbull's claim which may have been an attempt to create the image of a "Progressive Era" St. Francis of Assissi.

The only references to Noel so far discovered are on Trumbull's page 127, where he has Noel playing with his father's watch, (a human interest note which should have pleased female Dispensationalists) and the reference in the September 30, 1909, letter to Marie Helene. In the letter, Scofield hardly showed greater concern for this son than he had for his daughters. The complete absence of reference to Noel during the years when Scofield carried the boxes of notebooks back and forth across the Atlantic belies "love for children," especially his own. There is a suggestion of Dispensational lack of perception in Trumbull's stance.

Trumbull, in his chapter X, beginning on page 108, gets rather garbled on Scofield's Transatlantic wanderings. He has the Scofields apparently in Europe on a trip between the 1904 and 1907 journeys. The implied trip cannot be fitted in between the appearances of Scofield in Dallas recorded in First Church minutes (checked by BeVier). But the poor structure of Trumbull's story made a base for Gaebelein's later attempt to place Scofield in Europe in 1906 when he was actually at Lake Orion, Oakland County, Michigan.[8]

On his page 99, Trumbull refers to the conference which Scofield discussed in his letter of 7 August 1908 to Lyman Stewart.[9] But he plays down the role of the other editors as he wanted to build up the image of Scofield as the principal creator of the Great Opus. To promote man, work or both, Trumbull said:

> The man who gave his lifetime study to the making of the notes and comments in the Scofield Reference Bible was concerned only to *find and state exactly what the Bible itself had to say* on any and every point.[10]

The statement is incorrect on a number of counts. First, we have shown that he did *not* give a life of study to the notes. (We know some who say he did *nothing* toward the notes.) The comment in no way describes the notes, as Scofield studiously avoids comment on any passage relating to either divorce or family responsibility. The notes fall very far short of commenting on "any and every point." Matthew Henry does comment on the Scripture in the manner claimed by Trumbull, but not Scofield.

Either Trumbull was writing a blurb with the reckless abandon of an advertising man, or else he later lost his affection for *The Scofield Reference Bible.* In his introduction to an edition of Matthew Henry's *Commentary,* written on April 15, 1935, Trumbull said:

> Matthew Henry digs deep down below the surface of God's Word; he sees truths hidden from most of us until he has shown them. He finds the most practical applications of God's wisdom in our everyday life; and applications also from the successes and failures of the men and women who live before us in the pages of the Bible.[11]

Trumbull goes on and says:

> The Commentary is in constant use by the undersigned and other members of the editorial staff of *The Sunday School Times.*

While some people attempt to utilize both *The Scofield Reference Bible* and the Matthew Henry *Commentary,* the views on many important issues are so divergent that compatibility is almost impossible.[12] The use of Matthew Henry by the staff of *The Sunday School Times* suggests that the laity have been left with a work that is less than quality.

The most reasonable view of the result of the "Paul and Timothy" collaboration at Crescent City in the late winter of 1919 is that the two men collaborated to produce a story, a story which blithely disregarded fact. It may have helped promote *The Scofield Reference Bible.*

Trumbull did complete the interviews, then took the train back to Philadelphia. From his notes came the story which would become the book we have today. But the time Trumbull had his work ready for checking, Scofield was most likely back in Douglaston. We noted at least one place where hasty revision may have been made. Most of the issues of *The Sunday School Times* came out during the period Scofield usually spent at Crestwood.

There is every indication that both men were well satisfied with the production. But we hold that the story is the worst attempt at "biography" outside the political realm which came out in the early 20th Century. As a religious biography, it is unique, especially in the light of the professions of the movement to which author and subject belonged. Trumbull, with Scofield's assistance, used a pitchfork to do a "snow" job.

CHAPTER 36 NOTES

1. Trumbull, *op. cit.,* p. 25.
2. *Ibid.,* p. 30.
3. *Ibid.*
4. See chapter 14.
5. George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture,* Oxford, 1980, especially chapter XXIII.
6. Trumbull, *op. cit.,* p. 128. Incidentally, Conkling's paramour was Kate Chase Sprague, daughter of Lincoln's secretary of the treasury, Salmon P. Chase. Kate had been exposed to the group who welcomed and accepted The Secret Six.
7. Trumbull, *op. cit.,* p. 125.
8. Gaebelein, *Moody Monthly,* February 1943, p. 344.

9. See chapter 29.
10. Trumbull, *op. cit.*, pp. 80, 81.
11. Introduction to *Matthew Henry's Commentary of the Whole Bible,* Fleming H. Revell Co. Trumbull's note is dated April 15, 1935, so the edition was either 1935 or 1936.
12. Gaebelein was very ready to run down Matthew Henry's views on prophecy, using Dispensationalism as the bench mark.

CHAPTER 37

Gathered Unto His Fathers

"Sunset and evening star
And one clear call for me
And may there be no moaning of the bar
When I put out to sea."

Tennyson

Scofield returned to Crescent City, Florida, for the winter of 1919-1920. Evidently his mind was still very active even if he was failing physically. He was thinking of a revision of the Scofield notes. He wrote Gaebelein on March 22, 1920

> My dear Gaebelein:
>
> Thanks for telegram and letter from Galveston, I am greatly encouraged. Here are my thoughts concerning the work which you have so kindly consented to take upon your already overburdened shoulders: To
>
> (1) call my attention to any passage
>
> (a) needing a better rendering (in Margin)
>
> (b) particularly difficult passages which I have passed over, or
>
> (2) any editorial matter in which I seem to you to have erred.
>
> The copy which you will thus help to make more useful will be reset, but the Oxford people desire to preserve the present facsimile idea as carried out in the octavo and duo editions now out. A broad margin edition will be issued. Again thanking you,
>
> Yours as ever
> C. I. Scofield[1]

This communication appears to have had no circulation among the Dispensational public until Gaebelein wrote his sketch in 1942-43. And the sketch first appeared serially in a magazine, attracting little attention. The letter (and we have no other correspondence) suggests that in the minds of Scofield and Gaebelein, even with the revision of 1917, they had not produced a truly quality work.

The need for continual revision reminds us of none other than Charles Darwin who was continually revising his major work. Gary North notes of *Origin of Species:*

> The sixth edition was so far removed from the first that something like 75 percent of the first was rewritten by the final edition—rewritten as many as five times each, in the case of some sentences. The sixth edition was one-third longer than the first.[2]

Hardly evidence of developed thought of real assurance of values.

The willingness of those who master-minded *The Scofield Reference Bible* to revise, and to do so often, makes the heavy praise heaped on the work by Trumbull and Fundamentalist leaders over the years seem a bit trashy. And there is a moral responsibility also. If the notes were so badly in need of revision, then the leaders were derelict in allowing generations of Christians to have their religious thinking and their view of Biblical teaching shaped by notes greatly in need of revision. Unless, of course, they wanted an immature body of believers.

Our own study makes it evident that The Scofield Notes do not do justice to the Scriptures and are in many cases highly biased and sectarian comment. The whole thing makes clear the utter impropriety of linking the Eternal Word so closely with the comments of fallible men. The complacency with which the group around Scofield were willing to bring the Scriptures down to the level of men suggests that the group were afflicted with a strong case of "victory over humility."

Actually, despite the interest expressed to Gaebelein, nothing tangible resulted and the *Scofield Reference Bible's* notes remained intact until the revision of 1967. By 1920 Scofield was physically unable to really take on such a project. He returned to Douglaston in the Spring of 1920. There are no published reports of Scofield and his travels, if any, for the rest of 1920.

Luther Rees visited Scofield in Douglaston in January 1921. He reported that Scofield was not in good health, but that his mind was still clear. Rees mentioned that a book of Scofield's sermons was being put together.[3] While the book of sermons was not issued until after Scofield's death, its foreword was written in Feburary 1921, shortly after the visit of Luther Rees.

The collection was entitled *In Many Pulpits with Dr. C. I. Scofield,* and was issued by Oxford University Press. The foreword read:

> My withdrawal from pastoral work that I might prepare for publication the Scofield Reference Bible, made possible the larger pulpit ministry to which many doors in the United States, England, Scotland, the North of Ireland and Canada were open. From that ministry this book is a selection. Some sermons preached to my own people in Dallas, Texas, and East Northfield, Massachusetts, are also included.[4]

The dedication was an utterly appropriate dedication for a pastor and husband:

> To
> HETTIE
> My Cherished Wife
> And Co-Worker
> Through So Many, Many Years,
> I Dedicate This Book[5]

But there are intimations that Scofield held some quite different sentiments, sentiments expressed privately. We have a transcript of a letter dated May 4, 1921. If the transcript accurately copies Scofields words, the letter written in Douglaston and sent to daughter Abigail in San Luis Obispo contains statements utterly out of keeping with the ideals of the movement with which Scofield's name is linked.

The original of that letter was held by Mr. John H. Mize of Atchison, Kansas, after Abigail Kellogg died in 1958. In January of 1974, Mr. Mize sent me a packet of Scofield memorabilia, including the original of the May 4, 1921, letter, to Dallas Theological Seminary. Receipt of that material was acknowledged by Dr. John A. Witmer, librarian of the Seminary Library in his letter of January 23, 1974, to Mr. Mize. A pertinent paragraph reads:

> I have glanced at the collection, but have not had the opportunity as yet to examine it in detail and to place any valuation on it. From my preliminary glance I feel that it would probably be best to turn the material over to Scofield Memorial Church. If I do that, I will indicate to them my valuation of the material for tax purposes and they will issue you a tax deductible gift receipt.

Dr. Witmer concluded his letter:

> I do appreciate you much *(sic)* your willingess to make this material available either to Dallas Seminary or to Scofield Church. I can assure you that it will be preserved and used in further research on Dr. Scofield's life.

Rather remarkably, in the light of Dr. Witmer's statement to Mr. Mize, when this writer visited Dallas, first in 1979, and again in 1982, neither the seminary, nor the church were able to produce any Scofield memorabilia. (The sanctuary of the Scofield Church was destroyed by fire in 1976 and replaced by a new edifice on Abrams Road in 1980. The writer has been assured by Pastor Ashcraft that no Scofield memorabilia nor Church historical records were harmed in the fire of 1976.)

If the text reproduced below is accurate, and we feel that it is, it may have been considered necessary, in order to preserve a facade of integrity, to destroy that material which Dr. Witmer acknowledged on January 23, 1974. The style, abbreviations, and punctuation agree with Scofield's style in other letters which we have seen in the original. We consider it unlikely that anyone "making up" a letter would be able or careful enough to recreate Scofield's own style. The letter reads:

May 4/21

Douglaston Road
Douglaston, Long Island, N.Y.

My dearest Abbie:

Since your last letter came I have had spells of rather severe illness with intervals of lethargy—perhaps I should say laziness—and these, all

together, have kept my pen out of use. I forgive myself—too easily no doubt—for not summoning enough energy to write letters on the ground that despite giving no proof of it I have never lived so much in my love for you & Helen & L.M. as during these months of growing infirmity and—shall I say? uselessness.

Some work is going on, per secretary, mostly, but will soon end. I have prepared a book of my sermons which were preached here & there in the homeland and in England, Ireland, & Scotland. It will make a book of 320 pages. A copy will of course be sent you & Doctor. It will be called "With Dr. C. I. Scofield in Many Pulpits". I shall be glad if you will read the address which I gave in Wellington Hall, Belfast, on the Sunday following the loss of the Titanic. That ship was built in Belfast and many Belfast lives were lost in her sinking. I reached there Saturday (she sank Wednesday) and the Lord Mayor asked me to give the address at the memorial meeting arranged for Sunday afternoon. I spoke on "The Unsinkable Ship". They had called the "Titanic" by that name! I said that the only unsinkable ship in history was a frail boat on a stormy lake in Galilee, and it was unsinkable because the Lord of heaven & earth was asleep on her—etc. etc. etc.

A word about your bungalow—which is I suppose waiting realization for that third thousand dollars. How I long to start it on its way to you! Since beginning this letter it has come to me clearly that my fault lies in not really trusting *God* to give it to me. Instead I have been trying to "make" it. Lets pray together—you in Sam Luis Obispo, I in Douglaston—and it will surely come to one or the other of us. I believe with absolute conviction in the communion of saints—so do you, but you also believe in their intercession. Now I say in all reverence & seriousness, why don't you seek the special intercession of the San Luis in whose name-town you live? You surely will *not* accuse or suspect me of any lack of sincerity in this. Ah! *Now* we shall get that $1000. And our Heavenly Father loves us so that He might very likely add another five hundred to the thousand. Oh! but it will make me happy when it comes. We Scofields are home lovers. I can't bear to think of your increasing years under rented roofs. Mrs. Ingalls wrote me that Helen's husband had inherited a comfortable home. Thank God! Helen saw my home & will be able to tell you that it has the comforts which an aged man (78 in August!) needs. What a God and Father we have. Now do write me, Dearie. With love to Dr. Kellogg & to the L.M. if she is still with you.

Papa

Several statements in the letter are quite remarkable, especially if written by a man who has been built up as a remarkable saint in the Fundamentalist hagiography. Such as:

> Despite giving no proof of it I have never lived so much in my love for you & Helen & L.M. as during these months of growing infirmity and—shall I say? uselessness.

And: "With love to Dr. Kellogg & to the L.M. if she is still with you." "L.M." refers, of course to Leontine. If as hinted, there was still some feeling for Leontine, the marriage to Hettie becomes a sham. And why the divorce?

In the view of marriage as usually held in Christian circles, one is not properly supposed to love two women, and having taken marriage vows, can one properly bounce affection back and forth between two different women. The dedication of the book and the sentiments of the letter are in complete conflict. If he had held any love for Leontine in the 1879-1883 period, and if he had possessed one iota of proper Christian concern for his wife, why, why did he allow the divorce to go through? Even the *Atchison Patriot* reporter in 1881 questioned the basis for a divorce. Or was it necessary that Scofield shed a Catholic wife, regardless of feeling, in order that the church might be "blessed" with the *Scofield Reference Bible?*

The letter indicates that the Kellogg bungalow had not materialized. The inability on C. I.'s part to make further contribution to that project is strange in view of the major increase in royalties for the fiscal year which ended on March 31.

Note a further statement, utterly inconsistent with the position of Dispensationalism and with statements of Scofield himself made publically:

> Now I say in all seriousness, why don't you seek the special intercession of the San Luis in whose nametown you live? . . . *Now* we shall get that $1000.

Greenbacks from Papa would have saved San Luis a lot of trouble. By putting a stamp of approval on the practice of praying to saints, Scofield places himself in conflict with his official view of the Catholic Church which he had plainly stated on page 1346 of *The Scofield Reference Bible* (1917).

Note also that when the book of sermons, *In Many Pulpits with Dr. C. I. Scofield,* came out, it did not include one entitled "The Unsinkable Ship." Adam Loughridge has confirmed that such a sermon was *never* delivered in Belfast. Apparently some "exaggerations" had grown into firm delusions as the end approached. Philip Mauro's *Titanic* story is so superior.

In the same month that he wrote Abbie, he had prepared and signed his Last Will and Testament. Remarkably, the copies of that document in the Surrogate's file do not show signing date. (The statement of two of the witnesses, verifying the signature at the time of probate, also have a blank for the date of signing. Why?) No mention was made of either Abigail or Marie Helene. They were to receive no share of the estate. Was Papa working on the will when he made the suggestion to Abbie that she pray to San Luis?

The last time Scofield went to church was on Sunday, May 22, 1921, when he attended the service at the Community Church, Douglaston.[6] During July, Scofield became distressed by the fierce heat of

the summer. There were many hours of intense suffering, and family and close friends began to realize that complete recovery was impossible. During his last two days he was conconscious, but during the last few hours of life, the intense pain seemed to pass and he fell into a restful sleep.

He passed on without awakening just about 11:00 a.m. on Sunday, July 24, at that very hour when church bells were summoning congregations in the Eastern Time Zone to worship. The death certificate gave the cause of death as "Cardio Vascular Renal" disease.[7]

The funeral service was set for Wednesday, July 27, at 2:00 p.m. It is likely that notice was sent to Atchison and to San Luis Obispo. Abbie could not have reached Douglaston in time for the service. Marie Helene might have made it, if she has started immediately after receiving a telegram on Sunday. However, since to the Dispensational community, she was a non-person, her presence would have been a bit of an embarassment to Scofield's associates in Christian work.

The Community Church of Douglaston had no building of its own. So the services were held in the sanctuary of the First Baptist Church, in nearby Flushing. The Rev. M. Eugene Flipse, pastor of the Community Church, read the Scripture. The Rev. Wm. L. Pettingill presided and gave the funeral sermon. According to reports, the service was utterly informal, more like an hour at a Bible conference than a funeral. In the course of his remarks, Pettengill said:

> How many there are who testify that it was a red letter day in the religious experience when Dr. Scofield's little book, "Rightly Dividing the World of Truth" fell into their hands and led them into a working knowledge of the Scriptures. Many years ago in a Bible conference, a speaker testified that that little book had changed his own life, and his testimony was followed by a request to know how many others had been helped by it. Perhaps one hundred hands were held up. Dr. Scofield was a mighty man in the Scriptures. He never *defended* them, but always said, "Let them be taught"[8]

Mr. Flipse said of Scofield:

> One of the things that Dr. Scofield helped to accomplish in Douglaston, was the establishment of the Community Church. His influence in the entire community was very marked. He was universally beloved. He served as the pastor of this Community Church in the early days of its establishment a few years ago, and up to the time of his passing he maintained a hearty interest in its work and was one of its liberal supporters.[8]

From New York and Philadelphia came representative of Christian men and a number came over from the missionary conference at nearby Stony Brook. The Rev. Charles E. Hurlburt, general director of the Africa Inland Mission, brought the service to an end. He said:

> The debt which the missionary world owes to Dr. Scofield is beyond estimate. Men and women of the mission field, who never can get the time, in the midst of their strenuous labors, to mine as deeply into the treasures of the Word as they could wish, could feel in a large sense that this had been done for them by Dr. Scofield, as they followed him in his illuminating notes and analyses in his Reference Edition of the Bible. Years ago, Mr. Hurlburt said, he had learned that it was a dangerous thing to minister the Word of God without the power of the Holy Spirit. Dr. Scofield not only taught with exceptional clearness, but as he spoke the truth in love his teaching was ever fragrant with the exquisite perfumes of the Holy Spirit.[8]

Scofield was buried in the cemetery at Flushing in a plot which he had purchased earlier. (Possibly his faith in the Rapture had weakened.) The grave was covered by a mass of flowers sent by friends. As the company was dispersing from the graveside, a young man approached one of the men who had spoken at the funeral and said: "Where can I get a copy of that little book to which almost every one at the services this afternoon was referring?"[8]

The separation of man and work was already beginning. When Dr. James M. Gray, speaking at a conference at Eaglesmere, Pennsylvania, announced Scofield's death, he asked the audience present how many had ever heard him speak. Only five or six hands were held up. But when he asked how many were users of the Scofield Reference Edition of the Bible, "there was a perfect forest of hands!"[8]

The man had never been as real as his work.

CHAPTER 37 NOTES

1. Gaebelein, *op. cit., Moody Monthly,* March 1943, p. 400.
2. Gary North, *The Dominion Covenant—Genesis,* Institute for Christian Economics, Tyler, TX., 1982, p. 259. North is quoting Robert M. Young "Darwin's Metaphor: Does Nature Select?", *Monist,* LV (1971), p. 496.
3. Luther Rees, *The Central American Bulletin, No.* 188, Sept. 15, 1921, p. 3.
4. *In Many Pulpits with Dr. C. I. Scofield,* Oxford University Press, New York, 1922.
5. *Ibid.*
6. Reported to a reporter for *The Sunday School Times* by Rev. M. Eugene Flipse, paster of the church. *The Sunday School Times,* August 13, 1921, p. 435.
7. Death certificate supplied by the New York State Dept. of Health.
8. All reports on the funeral are taken from "Scofield, Spirit-Gifted Teacher, Falls Asleep," *The Sunday School Times,* August 13, 1921, p. 435.

CHAPTER 38

The Perils of Probate

"The Lord is the portion of mine inheritance and of my cup."
Psalm 16:5a

The will which Scofield drew up in May, was presented for probate with the Surrogate of Queens County on August 2, 1921. Scofield noted that he had provided "good and comfortable homes" for his wife and son. This suggests that title to "Greyshingles" and "Crestwood" had been transferred prior to Scofield's death. The entire estate was bequeathed to Hettie and Noel.

There is nothing in the will which gives even a hint that Scofield was a Christian. There is no statement of faith in Jesus Christ, no expression of hope for eternity. Statements of such import are often made by devout Christians. Even J. Pierpoint Morgan, Sr., opened his will with a statement of his faith in redemption by Jesus Christ.

Not only were Abigail and Marie Helene not mentioned, but there were no bequests to any Christian work, even those with which Scofield had long been associated. At the funeral, Rev. Mr. Flipse had said that Scofield had been "one of its liberal supporters," speaking of the Community Church in Douglaston. The will would indicate that liberality ended with Scofield's death. Similar treatment was accorded First Church, Dallas, The Central American Mission, The Philadelphia School of The Bible and Moody Bible Institute. No bequests to any of them.

A surrogate's document, Form 27, dated October 5, 1921, indicates that, pursuant to New York law, advertisements had been placed in two newspapers "one in each of four successive weeks" and copies of the notice sent by Registered Mail to Abigail and Marie Helene, notifying them of the filing of their father's will. There is no record of any response, and the girls evidently accepted denial of any share in the inheritance. (Their cooperation was, of course, necessary since to the Dispensational community they were, and had to continue to be, non-persons.)

No real estate is listed in the inventory. Except for $100.00 on deposit in the Flushing (N.Y.) Branch of the Corn Exchange Bank, the only assets listed in the inventory were these four contracts (agreements) with two provisions and their provision for royalty payments to the deceased. They constitute assets as the royalty payments would continue to be paid to Scofield's designated heirs for the duration of the contracts, as they were identified in the estate papers:

Contract with the Sunday School Times, Philadelphia, Pa., dated February 26, 1918, for publication of book entitled "What Do The Prophets Say?", copy of which contract is hereto attached and under which at the time of decedent's death there was on deposit with the Sunday School Times as royalties, $14.00,

Agreement dated August 4, 1920, between Rev. C. I. Scofield, D.D., and the Oxford University Press, New York City, for publication of book entitled "The Scofield Reference to New Testament and Psalms", copy of which contract or agreement is hereto attached and under which at the time of decendent's death on July 24, 1921, there was on deposit with the Oxford University Press as royalties $168.40, based on an average of six months' earnings.

Contract between Rev. C. I. Scofield, D.D., and Oxford University Press, New York City, dated November 1, 1917, for publication of book entitled "The Scofield Reference Bible," edited by deceased, copy of which contract is hereto attached and under which at the time of decedent's death there was on deposit with Oxford University Press as royalties $3,797.60, based on an average of seven months' earnings.

Agreement between Rev. C. I. Scofield, D.D., and Oxford University Press, New York City, dated October 1st, 1913, for publication of book entitled "No Room in the Inn" or "Interpretation of the Holy Scripture," copy of which agreement is hereto attached and under which at the time of decedent's death there was on deposit with the Oxford University Press as royalties $1.50.

From the statement of the appraiser, Louis Cohn, submitted April 24, 1922, we note the following most interesting evaluation:

> The books that the deceased wrote were reference books to the Bible, and in order to promote the sales of these books, Cyrus Ingerson Scofield, the decedent herein, attended religious and Chatauqua conventions, and spoke of his various writings.
>
> The ledger of the Oxford University Press shows that during the five years previous to the death of Cyrus Ingerson Scofield, the following amounts were paid to him as royalties.
>
> | | |
> |---|---|
> | March 31st. 1916 to March 31st. 1917 | $ 9,975.79 |
> | March 31st. 1917 to March 31st. 1918 | 14,891.91 |
> | March 31st. 1918 to March 31st. 1919 | 13,541.80 |
> | March 31st. 1919 to March 31st. 1920 | 17,908.94 |
> | March 31st. 1920 to March 31st. 1921 | 20,028.89 |
> | Royalties for Five years | $76,347.33 |
> | Average for One year | $15,269.46 |
>
> Since the death of Cyrus Ingerson Scofield, the ledger of the Oxford University Press shows that there has been a consistent falling off of the royalties due the estate, as though the death of Cyrus Ingerson Scofield, there is no one to promote the sales of the various books written by the deceased, and that within a few years these royalties will be a minimum."

The statement of Appraiser Louis Cohn: ". . . that within a few years these royalties will be at a minimum . . ." was a very natural forecast for an experienced appraiser. But it proved to be as wrong as wrong

could be as far as the major work was concerned. The sale of *The Scofield Reference Bible,* 1917 edition and its subsequent printings, soon took off and continued to rise until the revision of 1967. The benefits accrued to Hettie and to Noel as long as the contracts continued in effect. Even Albertus Pieters, first published critic to go on record, could not have imagined the angle of the upward sales curve during the 1920's,'30's and later.[1]

Based on the estimate of appraiser Cohn, the Surrogate accepted a total value for the estate of $23,004.18. On this value, the State of New York collected an inheritance tax of $111.73.

Hettie continued living at "Greyshingles" until her death, which occurred on November 23, 1923. Dr. Byron D. St. John of Port Washington, New York, listed the cause of death as "cystic degeneration of the kidneys and pulmonary edema."[2] Hettie was buried in the Scofield plot in Flushing Cemetery alongside Cyrus.

Material made available from Atchison gives no hint that Marie Helene or Abigail kept up any contact with Noel after their father passed on. Material has not been available from Noel and family. When William BeVier was working on his thesis in 1960, he made repeated requests of Noel Scofield for information. Had Noel acceded to BeVier's request, we might have had some indication of contact between Long Island and Kansas. However, Noel wrote BeVier: "Regret to advise you I cannot give you the data requested and please do not bother me in the future."[3] The church at large may have lost much significant data through such lack of cooperation.

Noel died in December 1962. At the time he was a resident of Nassau County, New York. When Noel's daughter (Scofield's granddaughter) was trying to settle her father's estate, she petitioned the Queens County Surrogate for permission to enter a safety deposit box still maintained by her grandfather's estate to determine whether any documents in that box might assist in settling Noel's estate.[4] The results of the search did not appear in available papers, and we must speculate on the continued existence of the estate of Cyrus I. Scofield, 40 years after his passing.

Neither Noel, his wife, nor the granddaughter played any role in the Dispensational movement or its evangelical successor.

CHAPTER 38 NOTES

1. Pieters, of Grand Rapids, Michigan, put his criticism of the work in print in the early 1920's. See *A Candid Examination of The Scofield Bible* by Albertus Pieters. Available from Reiner Publications, Swengel, Pa.
2. From death certificate supplied by The New York State Department of Public Health.
3. Letter, Noel P. Scofield to William A. BeVier, March 21, 1960. Quoted in BeVier, *op. cit.,* p. 2.
4. Copy of petition in Cyrus Scofield estate papers, Surrogate of Queens County, New York.

CHAPTER 39

Canonizing a Dispensational Saint

"Let us now praise famous men."

Ecclesiastis 44:1a

On Monday July 25, 1921, *The New York Times,* on its page 13, carried the following obituary of Scofield:

> DR. CYRUS I. SCOFIELD DIES.
> Religious Editor and Author Passes
> Away in Douglaston, L.I.
>
> The Rev. Dr. Cyrus Ingerson Scofield of the Southern Presbyterian Church, editor of the Scofield Reference Bible, died yesterday of a general breakdown at his home, Greyshingles, Douglaston, L.I. He was born in Lenawee County, Mich., seventy-eight years ago, and fought under Lee in the Confederate Army.
>
> Soon after being admitted to the bar in 1869, he served a term in the Kansas Legislature and for a time was United States Attorney for that State. It was in 1879 that, to use his own words, he was "converted to the Christian religion," three years later receiving his ordination. From then until 1895 he was pastor of the First Church in Dallas, Texas, leaving to take charge of the Moody Church at Northfield, Mass. Dr. Scofield returned to Dallas again for four years, retiring in 1909, and a few years later moved to Douglaston. He lectured extensively in Europe and this country. His many writings on religious subjects included "The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit" and "Rightly Dividing the World of Truth." He was the founder and secretary of the Central American Mission.[1]

The obituary was rather innocuous and close to the truth. A bereaved family can easily overlook details on the day of death and the undertaker never can know all details of the family background.

The obituary might not have been written if there had not been a paid insertion on the same page. This paid notice read:

> SCOFIELD, Dr. C.T. (sic), noted Bible Scholar and author, Sunday, at his home in Douglaston, L.I. Funeral will be held at Dr. Douglas's Church in Flushing, L.I., Wednesday, 2 P.M. St. Louis, Philadelphia, Boston, Detroit, Chicago, Harrisburg papers please copy.

A similar notice, but with correct middle initial, appeared in the *Tribune* (New York) next day. The selection of cities asked to note Scofield's passing is interesting. Dallas was probably taken care of by direct insertion. Atchison is conspicuously overlooked. It is not clear why Boston, Detroit, and Harrisburg were considered important, although Scofield's Michigan birthplace and his connections with the Northfield,

Mass., church and Bible School in Pennsylvania may have figured into the request for news coverage in those areas.

As far as we have been able to determine, the Chicago papers did not accede to the request from New York.

The *Kansas City Journal* did pick up the New York notice and in its edition of August 3, 1921, published the following story:

A BIT OF KANSAS HISTORY

An exceptionally well informed Kansan sends to The Journal some interesting facts connected with the political and ministerial history of the late Rev. Dr. Cyrus I. Scofield, who died a few days ago at Douglaston, N.Y. Somewhat condensed, the facts are thus stated by The Journal's informant:

Just before the sensational senatorial episode which resulted in the election John J. Ingalls over Samuel C. Pomeroy, Mr. Scofield, a young lawyer associated with Ingalls in Atchison, was a member of the legislature in 1872. Ingalls, who aspired to succeed Senator Pomeroy, in 1873, championed the candidacy of Scofield for that year—the legislature then being elected annually.

Senator Pomeroy, who also lived in Atchison county, at Muscotah, succeeded in defeating Scofield for renomination in Atchison county, but Ingalls quitely sent the young lawyer to Nemeha county to acquire a residence. Scofield was elected and in January, 1893, when the senatorial battle began, Ingalls had a staunch partisan in him.

At the anti-Pomeroy caucus Ingalls was nominated over John M. Price. Pomeroy was nominated by the regular caucus of his own supporters. When the legislature began balloting on the following day, State Senator A. M. York of Montgomery county sprang his famous bribery charge against Pomeroy, and Ingalls went to the senate to begin the great career which continued for so many years.

Scofield was rewarded with the United States district attorneyship, succeeding Albert H. Horton, who became United States judge, when he succeeded Mark W. Delahay, in turn being succeeded by Cassius G. Foster. Scofield as district attorney was succeeded by George R. Peck, and was seriously ill for a long time. He forsook the law on his recovery and embraced the ministry.

"He was a man of rare eloquence and power," remarks The Journal informant, "equal to any pulpit. When he appeared at Dallas, Tex., early in his career, his congregation worshipped in a shack, and when he was called to a pastorate in Connecticut he left behind the finest church edifice in Dallas. From the outset of his career he grew in force and power, until he became a noted preacher among the pulpit orators of the world.

"Dr. Scofield's widow and two married daughters live in Atchison. Mrs. Scofield was Miss Leontine Cerre of the noted French family of Papiu at St. Louis. Her father, Henry Cerre, was second in command of 'Captain Bonneville's Adventures,' written of so entertainingly by Washington Irving. This enterprise was financed by the original John Jacob Astor early in the last century, and was the first passage across the American continent in wagons."[2]

At least by 1921, the correspondent and paper had learned the correct spelling of the name. But the New England pastorate had slipped

down the Connecticut Valley one state. The correspondent referred to Leontine as widow, rather than ex-wife, a role Leontine was to take on in a few years. But in view of the sentiments which we understand were expressed in the letter of May 4, 1921, the "well-informed Kansan" may have chosen words more wisely than he knew. The other details of Scofield's life appear rather accurate.

The first memorial to Scofield in Christian circles appeared in the August 13, 1921, issue of *The Sunday School times,* the most prestiguous Dispensational journal. Apparently, *Times* readers in the Kansas City area were not bothered by two reports in just over 10 days referring to different wives in different cities. (People are not supposed to remember news after three days.)

The memorial article, appearing on page 435 of that August 13, 1921, issue was entitled: "Scofield, Spirit-Gifted Teacher, Falls Alseep." Written by Howard A. Banks, it bore the subtitle: "How" his hand clave to the sword." An introductory passage, including a quotation from Scofield's Reference Bible, read:

> "Physical death has for the believer a peculiar qualification. It is called 'sleep,' because his body may be awakened at any moment (Phi. 3:21,21; I Thess. 4:18–14). The soul and spirit live, independently of the death of the body, which is described as a tabernacle (tent), in which the 'I' dwells, and which may be put off (2 Cor. 5:1–8; cf. I Cor. 15:42–44; 2 Pet. 1:13–15). At the believer's death he is clothed upon with a 'house from heaven' pending the resurrection of the 'earthly house,' and is at once 'with the Lord' (2 Cor. 5:1–8; Phil. 1:23; Luke 23:43)."—Scofield Reference Edition of the Bible, page 1299.
>
> In addition to the glimpse on this page of the closing days of Dr. Scofield, and his record of a few all *too* inadequate tributes by friends, it is planned to publish several weeks hence a Scofield Memorial Issue of The Sunday School Times, when a fuller estimate of his notable life and ministry may be given.[3]

Strangely, or maybe not so strangely, the Scofield Memorial Issue never appeared. Apparently, the subscribers never demanded it. Trumbull and staff may have known quite a bit, including what we uncovered, which suggested that details were not advisable. 1921 was not the time to "rock the boat." The Scofield Reference Bible has a great future which not even Trumbull dared risk.

The article opened with a typical attempt to link Scofield and Moody:

> C.I. Scofield was D.L. Moody's pastor at Northfield. In a conversation between them one day it was agreed that if Moody died first, and Scofield was within reach, he was to preach at Moody's funeral; if Scofield died first, and Moody was within reach, he was to preach at Scofield's funeral. The text he would choose, Mr. Moody informed his pastor, if he were to be in the pulpit, would be 2 Samuel 23:10, where it was recorded of

> Eleazar, one of David's "mighty men," that he had battled against the enemies of the Lord until he was weary. . . .

As we noted in chapter 24, while Scofield pastored the church in Northfield, even Scofield himself would hardly have claimed to actually have been Moody's pastor in a personal sense. This story may have been a step in the attempt to intimately link the two men.

The Scofield family is described as follows:

> Mrs. Scofield, who was Miss Hetty van Wart; Mr. and Mrs. Noel P. Scofield, son and daughter-in-law, and their little daughter, constitute the surviving family.

Even the Surrogate of Queens County knew better, but it was Dispensational necessity that Abigail and Marie Helene be non-persons. The existence of Leontine? Imagine what a furor it would have created in Dispensational circles.

Banks reported that someone (carefully unidentified) at the funeral service had developed the *Titanic* story with a few embellishments that Scofield had not included at Moody in 1914:

> How Dr. Scofield's whole life was an illustration of the way in which opportunities come to one who lives his life in the sweep at the Holy Spirit's guidance, was dwelt upon by another speaker, as he related the incident of a visit by Dr. Scofield to Belfast, Ireland, just at the time when the Titanic, "the unsinkable ship," built at and sailing from Belfast, had sunk in the mid-Atlantic after collison with an iceberg. There were newly made widows and orphans in Belfast then because not a few of the workmen on the Titanic had gone across on this maiden voyage as part of her crew. There was a tenseness of feeling over the whole city which kept men from prosecuting their business with calmness and deliberation, and to break the spell of sadness a great mass-meeting had been arranged for the coming Sunday afternoon. The Mayor of the city asked Dr. Scofield to bring the message at that meeting. as he prayed for his message, God seemed to say to him that he should speak about the only unsinkable ship, the little craft upon which our Lord sailed across Galilee. Dr. Scofield drew from this incident wonderful lessons of comfort and help for the people of that bereaved city, as he pointed out that there was safety for time and eternity only in the Lord Jesus Christ.

The records of First Church, Dallas, do indicate a steady run of accessions to membership by profession of faith. But even Trumbull never dared to refer to Scofield as an "evangelist" aside from the evangelistic role of a true pastor. And Scofield's peripatetic schedule limited his pastoral role. But Pettengill at the funeral said of Scofield;

> (A)s one who loved and preached the saving Gospel message he was an evangelist, and as one who had shepherded little flocks, twice at Dallas, Texas, in his earlier ministry, as well as at Northfield, he was a pastor, but supremely he was a teacher, and this was his great life ministry.

In chapter 37, we referred to the reaction of Dr. James M. Gray as it was reported at the funeral. It seems to have been part of an effort

to make the work (SRB) become more prominent, as the man and his life were effaced. Back home, Gray saw to it that his journal never published a true obituary. *Moody Bible Institute Monthly,* in its September, 1921 issue, published, reputedly for the first time, Gray's testimonial to Scofield, given at the dinner held in New York nearly five years earlier. The article had under its heading, the following:

> The news of Dr. Scofield's death reached us as this issue was in preparation, and time being too brief to prepare a more adequate tribute to his memory, it being deemed not inappropriate to publish this testimonial which had not previously appeared in print.[4]

The note does not close the door, at least by implication, to the possibility of more on Scofield. However, nothing appeared for 21 years.

We have commented on other parts of Gray's testimonial. Note here that Gray either was inaccurate or else afflicted with a failing memory. Speaking of *The Scofield Reference Bible,* he said: "I think I am not wrong in saying that at Northfield, was begun the crowning work of Dr. Scofield's life—the Scofield Reference Bible."[5] Gaebelein has a different story, and we will note a third version. Who is correct? Commenting on the Bible, Gray said:

> This is Dr. Scofield's richest gift, he knows how to read the Word of God and give the sense, and cause people to understand the reading. He never writes or speaks in a haze. As was said of another, "No trace of indeterminateness can be found in any of his discussions of any subject! His insight pierces the intracacies."[6]

There are shelves full of commentaries which show that Scofield's determinateness was worse than misdirected. Gray may have been "using a shovel," but his statement was good advertising copy.

In September 1921, *The Central American Bulletin,* paper of the mission which Scofield founded, published memorials to its founder. The lead story by Luther Rees, one-time assistant to Scofield, opened with:

> Cyrus Ingerson Scofield was born near Detroit, Michigan on August 19, 1843, where his father, an officer in the regular Army was stationed at the time. The family home was near Lebanon, Tennessee, and here he received his early education.

As we noted earlier, Clinton was not "near" Detroit. The National Archives could find no record of military service for Elias Scofield either as an officer or enlisted man. Tennessee was never the "family" home, only the residence of a brother-in-law. The story of education in Tennessee conflicts with both Trumbull and fact.

The article refers to "legends" that Scofield told about The War Between the States, accepts Scofield's exaggerated story of his role in the Regis Loisel case, makes Scofield a member of the Kansas Senate

instead of the lower House, and it repeats the factually impossible story of the conversion.

Under the heading *APPRECIATIONS,* Judge D. H. Scott of Paris, Texas, gives a possible hint as to when Scofield first saw the Horse Guards in London. His comments suggest that Scofield was unknown in England in 1892.[8] But it was different when Scott went back in 1904: "When in 1904, I went again, it was generally conceded that he had no superiors and few equals in that land." The Horse Guards must have been first seen when Scofield was supposed to be functioning as Moody's pastor in Northfield.

Scott makes another statement which conflicts with an exchange of letters with Gaebelein, to which we referred earlier. Scott said: "For some three years past, Dr. Scofield has been growing feeble and has had less to do with this old earth and its affairs. . . ."[9] But he still wanted to revise the Scofield Bible. Hardly an early retreat in the direction of Heaven. Men just could not seem to report accurately when they spoke of Scofield.

On Sunday, November 27, 1921, the whole day was given over to memorial services for Scofield at the First Church in Dallas. The *Dallas Morning News,* next day, devoted five columns on its page 7 to reporting the affair. Looking at the report of the day, one gets an impression that some tributes dripped with gooey syrup, if they had any truth in them.

Dr. W. Irving Carroll, one of Scofield's students and, at the time, pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Marshall, Texas, delivered the address at the morning service. Speaking of Scofield's work, he said:

> He was the greatest Bible expositor of his generation and there have been none to equal him in clarity of thought nor brevity of thought of any generation. I am saying this, not in fulsome flattery of the man's life, but simply in recognition of a great fact. I say again that no man ever had a deeper insight into the revealed truth of Scriptures nor a broader grasp.[10]

This is, of course, why Trumbull's staff prefered Matthew Henry to Scofield (chapter 34).

It was in that address that Carroll brought out Scofield's evasiveness about his visit to Oxford:

> I sought to get him to talk of his visits to Oxford University and to hear from his lip something of the conversation around the faculty table in the dining hall. Little would he ever say and always was anxious to turn the conversation into other channels.[11]

We have suggested that the evasiveness was necessary because of what actually happened on Scofield's trip.

In chapter 30, we noted the matter of the world "millennium." Carroll's statement at this point is:

> In his writings he is careful of his choice of words and used those that delicately balanced with his meanings. The word millenium is a perfectly good Biblical word [Not so—JMC] and yet you will not find it used by Dr. Scofield. It suggests controversial aspects, so he always employed the word "Kingdom."

True, the word *millennium* is not found in the Bible. Its use in the Scofield camp is because of a questionable use of one passage, Rev. 20:1-5, and that usage is a very terrible example of a racist view.

In the afternoon of the November 27 memorial service, there were five speakers. The first speaker, the well-known pulpit orator, Dr. George W. Truett of the First Baptist Church, Dallas, included the following statement about Scofield in his remarks: "Sincerity was as real to him as life itself. If sincerity is lacking, life is a ghastly shadow. Everyone felt that he was a prince of a true man."[12] But, unknown to Dr. Truett, there were three women, one in California and two in Kansas, who might dispute that statement. Truett could be easily carried away. In preparation for the 1916 wing-ding, he had written a testimonial which sounded very much like his remarks in 1921. In the written statement, he included this line: ". . . His reference Bible is a monumental achievement."As years have passed, disagreement with this point has grown. How much did Truett really study the Scofield opus?

The fourth afternoon speaker, George B. Dealey, a parishioner of the church, newspaperman and friend of Scofield, led into his tribute to Scofield with a capsule history of the English Bible. As he neared his conclusion, he said of Scofield: "Yet with all his wonderful accomplishments, his power and wisdom and remarkable talents in expounding the Word, he was the most modest of men, sure evidence of this true greatness."[13] But true modesty does not appropriate false honors or claim false achievements.

The conclusion of the services was not reported, but following the speakers, letters of appreciation were read from writers all over the country, all apparently in the same vein.

One would hardly expect Oxford University Press to be either objective or negative about its prize property, but considering that with Scofield, slight praise usually builds up into exaggeration, a comment in an Oxford University Press book published in 1925 (New York) is most interesting. The work was *A Year's Bible Course* by Rev. Charles H. Morgan, Ph.D., with 475 "Questions and Answers For Class Use and Private Study." Not only was the work based on the Scofield Bible notes, but it was printed with the same type and bound to exactly resemble the cloth binding in which the major work was issued. In the foreword, Morgan (a connection with either G. Campbell Morgan or J. Pierpont Morgan has not been established) says of Scofield:

> Dr. C.I. Scofield was not only a great evangelical teacher but a great evangelistic teacher. Multitudes have been drawn toward the gates of

> the life eternal, multitudes of converts have been grounded in the new life in Christ by the Scofield Reference Bible; and the author and publishers of this course press with prayerfal aspiration toward the same goal. Evangelists and pastors can largely insure the spiritual health, happiness, and continuance of all person newly enlisted for Christ by seeing that they possess the Scofield Reference Bible and this instructor in the same—A Year's Bible Course.[14]

While we do not deny that exposure to the Word, even when laden with Scofield notes, can bring seeking souls to a knowledge of Jesus Christ, we find no evidence that he could be placed in the company of "evangelists" as 20th Century American Fundamentalists measures them. The idea that the publishers are concerned about men finding new life in Christ Jesus is remarkable in view of the bias of Oxford University noted from 1830 on and even experienced in modern times by C. S. Lewis.[15] Exaggeration and Scofield seem always linked.

On Sunday, May 30, 1926 (which in Texas was *not* Memorial Day), a Scofield feature appeared in *The Daily Times Herald* of Dallas. Most of the first page of the paper's Part 6 (Automotive-Radio-Special Features) was devoted to Scofield and his book. The by-line is that of Carey Snyder. But Snyder must have worked closely with or utilized a hand-out from someone either at the church or at the school (now Dallas Seminary), who was interested in image-building. The article includes items that could only have been made available by an intimate of Scofield and not obtainable through the usual digging of a reporter.

Synder started the article by referring to the Bible and its beginning, a beginning quite different from what Gray related in 1916 or what Gaebelein was to write in 1942:

> Mid the poverty of a saloon keeper's home in Dallas more than forty years ago was born the inspiration which finally resulted in the compilation of the most important Bible reference work today.[16]

Synder continues his story with the usual legends circulated within Fundamentalism and even makes D.L. Moody a member of Dr. Goodell's Pilgrim Congregational Church in St. Louis. Several other noteworthy points are:

1. The Cross of Honor is carefully referred to, but in such way that the exaggerated claim can be reinforced, but at the same time squelch questions by knowing Confederate veterans in the Dallas area.
2. The transparency incident (chapter 12) is placed in East St. Louis, rather than St. Louis. If any of Scofield's "society friends" were in East St. Louis to see him parade, they must have been real rounders.
3. His ordination is referred to with the following statement: ". . . and he was soon ordained to the Christian ministry. Instead of passing lightly over his past life during the ordination services, Dr. Scofield insisted that his whole past life he entered into by the presbytry so that they would understand thoroughly under what conditions he came to the church."[17]

The word *presbytery* in the story may be a clue that this bit was made up long after the event. We find it impossible to believe that the council (Congregational, not Presbyterian) would have accepted Scofield if he had done what Snyder claimed. This is especially true regarding the divorce suit pending on the day of ordination.[18]

4. The story of the missing boxes (chapter 29) on shipboard is related as taking place on a return from England, not Switzerland. Snyder has them delivered from the ship to New Hampshire after Scofield's landing. And in almost the same breath, he relates the story of the burning tent at Ashuelot. The manner of reference increases our doubts about the truth of both incidents.

Could it have been that stories were beginning to circulate about the Tennessean from Michigan? If so, the Dispensational hierarchy would want stories circulating around Dallas, so well-knit, so "authenticated" that they would be, in advance, refutation of questions which were rearing their nasty heads. Maybe sales of the Bible needed a bit of a boost.

The nearest thing to an attempt to tell about Scofield's life came in 1942, and even that effort was primarily to promote the Bible, with biographical details incidental. A.C. Gaebelein, the last surviving editor of the original Scofield Bible, wrote a series on the book which ran in *Moody Monthly News* late in 1942 and early 1943. Even then, criticism of Scofield stung those closest to him. On that point, Gaebelein whined:

> It seems that after his home-call the critics of the splendid service he rendered the Church increased as never before. Why did they keep so silent during this lifetime? Why did they wait until an answer from his side was no longer possible?[19]

Scofield's critics had not originally been able to pierce the cloud of respectability which was associated with the SRB. They had never expected American Christians to really accept what *The Scofield Reference Bible* turned out to be. And why, at any time, should the work of a very fallible human being so immune from criticism?

In his story, Gaebelein repeats the cliches about the war decoration. He jumps flatfootedly into the academic career that never was. The relation of events in Kansas leaves the required impression that Cyrus was a bachelor at the time.

Gaebelein relates with some fullness an item noted by Trumbull.[20] This human interest gem is that after Scofield's conversion (which took place in a non-existent law office), Cyrus was told that his mother, prior to her death, had expressed a wish that he enter Christian service.

The story just oozes both human interest and "Christian" devotion. Its factual basis is a bit flimsy. Both Trumbull and Gaebelein relate it in such a way that its veracity cannot be checked. Elias had died in

1870, nine years before the "official" conversion date. There is no firm evidence that Cyrus ever saw his father after his discharge from the Army. Only Emeline might have been old enough in 1843 to have remembered such a wish—if it was actually expressed. The atittude of Scofield's sisters, nieces and nephews about his role after 1879 suggests that they could not have been the source of the story. It sounds so like trite Fundamentalist jargon that it could not have originated in either 1879 or 1843.

As evangelical publishing came of age after World War II, the idea of a real biography of Scofield was either passed over, rejected or not considered. The lists of Christian biographies do not include anything on the most prominent Fundamentalist.

In the late 1950's, William A. BeVier, then a graduate student at Southern Methodist University, Dallas, undertook a study of Scofield as his master's thesis. The work has been referred to frequently in this study, but it has not been formally published. Copies are in the libraries of a number of Christian schools, colleges and seminaries.[21]

BeVier's work is inadequate because it takes Trumbull as an accurate biography and uses it as a standard against which all other data is to be measured. Further, as already noted, BeVier found that Scofield's only direct survivor refused to cooperate, making the work inadequate on family matters. Even the acceptance of BeVier's thesis did not stimulate any interest within the Evangelical-Fundamentalist camp for a real biography.

It seems that the Dispensational establishment finds image to be of more concern than accuracy. Dr. Frank E. Gaebelein, son of A.C., in 1959, prepared a Golden Anniversary pamphlet on *The Scofield Reference Bible* for Oxford University Press. This was followed in 1967 by another, *The New Scofield Reference Bible: Its Background and Making*.[22] Both pamphlets were probably promotional material.

Frank Gaebelein must have utilized Trumbull for his biographical data. However, Gaebelein managed to produce conflicts between his 1959 and 1967 sketches. In 1959, he made a reasonable condensation of Trumbull, making the district attorney role distinct from the St. Louis period.[23]

Possibly he felt that some revision should accompany the *Revised Scofield Reference Bible*. In the 1957 pamphlet, he says: "Following a term in the State Legislature, in 1879 he was appointed United States Attorney for Kansas by President Grant. The same year he became a Christian."[24] Besides giving Grant a term as president which he never served, the more recent relation condenses to the point of improbability and complete inaccuracy. Such carelessness on the part of a professional educator could imply contempt for the intelligence of the clientele.

Scofield inflated his accomplishments and altered the story of his life with considerable abandon. The abandon leads the researcher to

feel that truth was the first casualty. Further, it suggests the appalling possibility that some of his associates, men of cloth, not only revelled in the hope of suffering for others (the pre-tribulation Rapture), but were also completely ambivalent in dealing with facts.

A quotation from Scofield himself is appropriate to repeat at this point:

> . . . Now, conduct in the long run, springs from character. A bad man does not habitually do good actions, nor a good man habitually do evil actions. We all know these things; they are very familiar to us.[25]

How come, "Dr." Scofield?

CHAPTER 39 NOTES

1. *The New York Times,* Monday, July 25, 1921, p. 13.
2. *The Kansas City Journal,* Aug. 3, 1921.
3. *The Sunday School Times,* Aug. 13, 1921, p. 435ff.
4. *Moody Bible Institute Monthly, September 1921, p. 550ff*
5. *Ibid.,* p. 552.
6. *Ibid.*
7. *The Central American Bulletin,* Paris, Tex., Sept. 15, 1921, No. 188, p. 1.
8. *Ibid.,* p. 4.
9. *Ibid.,* p. 5.
10. *The Dallas Morning News,* Nov. 28, 1921, p. 7.
11. *Ibid.*
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Ibid.*
14. *A Year's Bible Course,* Oxford University Press, New York, 1925, p. 10.
15. Walter Hooper, *Through Joy and Beyond,* Macmillan, 1982. Note especially p. 125: "But it was considered unforgivable that Lewis wrote international best-sellers, and worse still that many were of a religious nature."
16. *The Dallas Times Herald,* May 30, 1928, Section 8, p. 1.
17. *Ibid.*
18. Compare Snyder's story with chapters 15 and 17 herein.
19. A.C. Gaebelein, *op. cit.,* p. 401, March 1943 installment.
20. A.C. Gaebelein, *op. cit.,* p. 128, November 1942 installment; Trumbull, *op. cit.,* p. 9.
21. The full title is cited in the Introduction to the present work.
22. Frank E. Gaebelein, *Golden Anniversary, The Story of the Scofield Reference Bible,* Oxford University Press, New York, 1959, p. 7.
23. Frank E. Gaebelein, *The New Scofield Reference Bible, Its Background and Making,* Oxford University Press, New York, 1967, p. 5.
24. *Ibid.*
25. C.I. Scofield, *Addresses on Prophecy,* p. 4.

CHAPTER 40

In Conclusion

"Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man."
Ecclesiastes 12:13

This study of the life of C. I. Scofield is different from any biography of any person who ever played a part in the development and spread of the Christian message. Unfortunately, legal documents which establish dates and verify events in the man's life do not permit a truly "Christian biography." From Scofield's life, we cannot learn that which edifies, inspires or instructs by example. The man's letters suggest a discrepancy between the public and private man, a discrepancy of considerable proportion. The sermons viewed over a span of years suggest little, if any, development of thought. Some speeches suggest crass opportunism.

Even a limited study of his major work, *The Scofield Reference Bible,* suggests that it is a shoddy piece of work. In no way does it deserve the praise heaped on it by his contemporaries and by later adherents. It is not worthy of the place it occupies among Evangelical and Fundamental Christians. And what possible justification was there for the "revision" of 1967?

It would be hard to praise a man like Scofield and still adhere to truth or be accurate. Those who have spoken and written in his praise have not attempted the difficult, nearly impossible task of being accurate. Praise appears to have been more important. Even the inaccuracies of Trumbull's book cannot carry the entire blame for inaccurate reports about the man.

Chapter 39 outlines the Dispensationalists' lack of regard for accuracy. This carelessness (or worse!) seems endemic among those who accept the Scofield system of interpretation of Scripture. A recent appearance The most recent appearance of the Scofield "story" was in *The Fundamentalist Journal,* October 1983, issue. Written by William A. BeVier (who previously wrote the thesis referred to in this work), it is entitled *C. I. Scofield: Dedicated and Determined.*[1] The article started on page 37 of the magazine, ran on page 38, continuing on page 39. At the bottom of the unfinished last column of page 39 was a note

"continued on page 56." We thumbed the magazine, but could find nothing more on Scofield. The magazine has a different edition of the article, with the story complete and ending on page 39. (The corrected edition deletes the story of the academic career that never was.) This corrected edition, at time of writing, has not been made generally available. Blame for the fiasco was placed on a "production error."[2] This sounds entirely too much like a typical management "cop-out" which places the blame somewhere down the line of command.

Our check showed at least nine errors in the original story. Since BeVier had been in touch with this writer, both before and while preparing the article, his failure to take advantage of later research is amazing.

Carelessness with everyday truth permeates the movement. Note stories, related with breathless abandon, of trainloads of stone shipped from southern Indiana to New York, thence Israel for rebuilding the Temple in Jerusalem. As one familiar with railroads, the inability of the railroads to locate such shipments might not seem surprising, except that such have never been made. Common sense views of Scripture and firm refutation by Israeli embassies indicate that such stories are total fabrications. Unembarrased Fundamentalist denials indicate no sense of shame for playing with truth or the faith of the following.

Dwight Wilson, in *Armageddon Now!*[3] notes:

> The premillinarian's history, however, is strewn with a mass of erroneous speculations which have undermined their credibility. Sometimes false identifications have been made dogmatically, at other times only as probabilities or possibilities, but the net result has always been the same—an increased skepticism toward Premillennialism.

Wilson then lists events from the Russo-Japanese War to the Six Day War of 1967 which were noted by Premils as "prophetic fulfillments." Of particular interest, he notes:

> . . . The supposed restoration of Israel has confused the problem of whether the Jews are to be restored before or after the coming of the Messiah. The restoration . . . has been pinpointed to have begun in 1897, 1917, and 1948.

He starts the final paragraph of his chapter with: "It is not likely that the situation (untrue "prophetic fulfillments") will change greatly."

When the heirs of Scofield try to be scholarly, they come up very short, and even then display a lack of responsibility toward the laity they lead and who support them. Charles C. Ryrie, well-known for his "Ryrie Study Bible" (a late 20th Century revision of Scofield's opus), is the author of two quality works on Dispensationalism. In *The Basis of The Premillenial Faith* (1953)[4], he says: "Premillennialism is the historic faith of the Church." In his *Dispensationalism Today* (1965)[5],

we note: "... At any rate, evidence is available that Dispensational concepts were held early and throughout the history of the Church." Both statements are rather lacking in accuracy.

In 1977, the Department of Historical Theology of Dallas Seminary accepted a graduate thesis prepared by Alan Patrick Boyd, entitled: "A Dispensational Premillennial Analysis of the Eschatology of the Post-apostolic Fathers (Until the Death of Justin Martyr)"[6] In his conclusion, page 89, Boyd says: "It is the conclusion of this thesis that Dr. Ryrie's statement (from Basis, *supra*) is historically invalid within the chronological framework of this thesis." He then cites five reasons why the Dallas view cannot be considered congruent with the views held in the Patristic period. Thus he invalidates the claim (made from Darby to Lindsay) that the view represents a recovery of past teaching.

In the "Preface" to the thesis, Boyd notes:

> ... the author would like to acknowledge, on the basis of classroom and private discussion, that Dr. Charles Ryrie, whose statements regarding the historicity of Dispensational premillennialism in the Church Fathers are carefully scrutinized in this thesis, has clarified his position on these matters. Unfortunately, he has not published these clarifications, and it is hoped that we will do so in the near future.[7]

Unfortunately, from that day (1977) to the present, we have noted no move in this direction. The statements are at best evidence of careless scholarship, at worst something much more undesirable. But they remain as definitive statements for the instruction of the Dispensational following even though they are palpably incorrect. But, a stream can rise no higher than its source, that source being C. I. Scofield.

Value-judgments are unpopular and, of course, should be carefully made. Remarkably, we have a statement from Scofield himself, which can well serve as a value-judgment on the Scofield phenomenon:

> Character is what we are. Conduct is what we do. A great many people seem to think that reputation and character are identical things. That is not so. Reputation is what is said about us. Character is what we are. I believe that, in the long run, character and reputation and conduct will all harmonize. For a time our reputation may be better or may be worse than we deserve. Very severe things may be said about us. If we are right with God though, we need not mind that. We need not greatly concern ourselves about it, for in due time we shall be vindicated. On the other hand, we may be believed to be better than we are. Now, conduct in the long run, springs from character. A bad man does not habitually do good actions, nor a bad man habitually do evil actions. We all know these things; they are very familiar to us.[8]

It is hard to avoid a feeling that the whole business makes a mockery of the Dispensational affection for II Timothy 2:15: "A workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." The ultimate value-judgment may be that the movement produced neither competent workmen nor those actually concerned about Truth.

Dr. Arnold Dallimore, biographer of George Whitfield and more recently writer of a study of Edward Irving, has said:

> If a person writing history makes a false statement whether because of carelessness, lack of knowledge or in a desire to make his account agree with some preconceived idea—his error will be compounded by being repeated again and again throughout generations to come. How unconscionable a man must be to indulge in such conduct, and with what great carefullness ought he to search out the facts, diligently examining all the evidence on every side of any issue, and presenting his findings with exactitude![9]

We submit that this has not been observed in the matter of Cyrus Scofield, and that the whole prophetic subject has been treated with similar carelessness. This could account for the lack of careful history noted by Dr. Wilbur M. Smith.

It may turn out that this attempt to study seriously the prophetic movement and its men will be a case of "whistle-blowing." The most reasonable interpretation of the work of Scofield is that it is neither honest nor valid. As such it should have the "whistle" blown, for it is properly outside the line of valid Christianity. Unfortunately, "whistle-blowing" remains unpopular. Frederick Sturdivant of Ohio State University noted regarding "whistle-blowing":

> People have a team-spirit mentality. To violate the code—to be a squealer and break up the team—is generally frowned on.[10]

There is more than a hint that the well-established Evangelical movement has tried to protect itself against such a dreadful prospect. The idea of a Scofield study was suggested to nine different publishers of Christian books. Despite the fact that the man has never received definitive treatment, the subject was dismissed without consideration of the manuscript and its merits. The claim was generally "no interest," a claim belied by Jerry Falwell's decision to have a Scofield story in his magazine.

Why would Evangelicals, devoted to be Truth, fear "whistle-blowing" on the Scofield matter? Time has run out for the "Rapture Cult" idea. This is due in part to the utter inadequacy of the idea, and in greater part to the dedicated work of people as diverse as Dave MacPherson and R. J. Rushdoony. Evangelicals are trying to disengage themselves from what must seem a tottering wreck; a wreck erected by Gaebelein and Scofield.

Indications of a shift in the prophetic trend come in from all over the land. But the leaders have done entirely too well in educating the people in the pew, who, will in most cases not follow their leaders. If the pulpit takes a firm stand, it risks alienating the constituency, with costly consequences. Thus, they are moving gradually, carefully, timidly

and with real conviction. Now is no time for a "whistle-blower" to upset things.

Speaking of the typical consequences of "whistle-blowing," Henry Druham, an ex-Lockheed worker said:

> There's certainly a defect in our society when people who call attention to wrongdoings are ostarized, fried, criticized and virtualy abandoned.[11]

We rather expect that from La Mirada to Langhorne, from Barrington to Greenville, this work will be treated with disdain, the writer villified and discredited in every way possible. (Of course, it may be treated to the censorship of complete neglect.) It is not unlikely that at locations along Swiss Avenue, Abrams Road, North LaSalle Street, and West Belmont Avenue, the writer will be as welcome as Adolf Eichmann might have been at a synagogue in Brooklyn.

Somehow, we get the feeling, very strongly, that the words of The Preacher of long ago: "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this the whole duty of man" (*Ecclesiastes 12:13*) have not been observed in the camp which centered around Scofield. Had all the church observed this, the whole matter would not have arisen. The passage just quoted is the only solution to matters prophetic, temporal and personal.

CHAPTER 40 NOTES

1. The *Fundamentalist Journal* is the publication of the movement headed by Jerry Falwell. It originates in Lynchburg, Va.
2. Letter of October 5, 1983 from Earlene R. Goodwin, editorial assistant of the *Fundamentalist Journal*, sent to Wm. A. BeVier.
3. Dwight Wilson, *Armageddon Now!* Baker, 1977, pp. 216–218. Wilson is Professor of Bible at Bethany Bible College, Santa Cruz, Calif.
4. Charles C. Ryrie, *The Basis of The Premillennial Faith* (Neptune, N.J., Loiseaux Brothers, 1953), p. 17.
5. Charles C. Ryrie, *Dispensationalism Today* (Chicago, Moody Press, 1965), p. 68.
6. The thesis remains unpublished. This writer obtained access to a copy through the Interlibrary Loan System. In his preface, Boyd, who has consistently held to the Dallas-Dispensational theology, said, in an attempt to hold thought to a Dispensational straightjacket:

   "At this point, the author would assert that any apologetical or polemical use of the conclusions of this thesis must be based on a viable historiography of patristic theology. In other words, one can not assume the truthfulness of his eschatological position simply because there are adumbrations of it in the patristic writings."
7. The preface to the thesis is on two unnumbered pages at the beginning of the work.
8. C. I. Scofield, *Address on Prophecy*, Our Hope, New York, 1910, p. 4.
9. Arnold A. Dallimore, *Ministerial Strength and Weakness: A More Realistic Look at John Wesley*, Spring Lecture delivered at Toronto Baptist Seminar, February 20-22, 1980. Published in *The Gospel Witness*, August 14, 1980, p. 7. Fundamenatlist Robert Sumner, editor of *The Biblical Evangelist*, in his blast at the writer referred to in the Foreword, tried to apply the Dallimore quote to this writer. He was so sure that

anything which did not slavishly follow the Dispensationalal "party-line" had to be untrue and written only for base motives.

10. *The Wall Street Journal,* May 21, 1976. Article "Spilling the Beans," "Disclosing Misdeeds of Corporations Can Backfire on Tattlers," by John S. Lublin. Quotation is from the article.
11. Also from "Spilling the Beans."